

THE STONE AGE BY



WALTER L. VOEGTLIN, M.D., F.A.C.P.

Based on In-depth Studies
of Human Ecology and the
Diet of Man

THE STONE AGE DIET

- * It's Safe
- * It's Sane
- * It's Simple, and
- * It Really Works!

by

WALTER L. VOEGTLIN, M.D., F.A.C.P.

VANTAGE PRESS

New York / Washington / Atlanta / Hollywood

FIRST EDITION

**All rights reserved, including the right
of reproduction in whole or in part in any form.**

Copyright © 1975 by Walter L. Voegtlin, M.D., F.A.C.P.

**Published by Vantage Press, Inc.
516 West 34th Street, New York, New York 10001**

Manufactured in the United States of America

Standard Book Number 533-01314-3

NOTE

The reader will find a series of numbers in parentheses () interspersed throughout this book. These numbers refer to the Bibliography and Footnote section, starting with page number 265.

In effect, each number in parentheses refers to the publication and/or periodical from which the statement so noted was taken. This unique method of footnote notation makes for much easier reading and quick reference availability, since many of these parenthetical references are repeated numerous times and would involve an inordinate amount of unnecessary trouble for the reader.

In this manner, Dr. Voegtlín's splendid bibliography serves a twofold purpose and leaves his writing undisturbed.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

1	WHAT IT'S ALL ABOUT	1
	Man's carnivorous beginning—Much later he tries farming—He adds a bit to his diet—This little bit and how it grew—Modern Man, over-smart nutritionist—His now topsy-turvy diet—A pause and a question—High protein-fat or high carbohydrate—A fear looming in Man's future—	
2	LOW CARBOHYDRATE—AN OLD "NEW DEPARTURE" DIET	7
	First carbohydrate complication: obesity—The saga of Dr. Harvey—Others follow—Growing interest in the Stone Age diet—Increasing medical acceptance—New hope for nervous indigestion—Need Man's diet be exotic and complicated?—Nature's scheme; herbivores eat plants; carnivores eat herbivores—Civilization's King-Size stomach ache—	
3	A PHILOSOPHER CHOOSES HIS DIET	15
	Philosophy dissected—Aristotle philosophized about light and look what happened—Danger in armchair philosophy—A lost hunter perishes—Fundamental differences of herbivore and carnivore—Cellulose and plants for food—Need for processing of plant foods—Apparent enigma of vegetarianism—The coconut	

eaters—Diet of primates—Is Man herbivore or carnivore?—How would you bet?—

4 A DOG

25

Dog is carnivorous—A short, small, simple digestive tube—A concentrated diet—His digestive processes—Intermittency—Why digestion is necessary—It occurs only in small intestine—It is a vital organ—Gall bladder important—Microorganisms unnecessary—Dog utilizes virtually 100% of his food—

5 A SHEEP

33

Sheep is herbivorous—Unbelievably complicated and capacious digestive tube—Stomach with 4 chambers—Cuds and chemurgy—Diet bulky and poor quality—Vital role of Microorganisms—Miracle of animal proteins from fodder—Weak digestive juices—Large cecum and long colon—Digestion slow and continuous—Occurs in all parts of digestive tube—Gall bladder weak or absent—All parts of digestive tract are vital—Sheep wastes 50% of its food—

6 AND A MAN

41

Man's short, simple digestive tract—Anatomically identical with dog (except appendix)—Functions identically—Conclusion: Man constructed as carnivore—Functions as carnivore—He should eat as a carnivore—Table of comparison: Dog, Sheep, Man—

7 HOW FOOD BECOMES YOU

47

The three food substances: protein, fat, carbohydrate—Protein may be animal or vegetable—Digestion of proteins—Fats also animal or vegetable—Digestion of fats—Carbohydrate comes from plants only—Digestion of carbohydrates—Absorption of food substances—How body utilizes

food substances—Resynthesis in the liver—The essential amino acids—All present in animal protein—Some missing in vegetable protein—Carnivores cannot synthesize essential amino acids—Herbivores can—Carnivores must have animal protein in diet—Herbivores need not—Fats as source of energy—Glucose dependent tissue—Liver may synthesize glucose from both fat and protein—Thus carnivores, including Man, are nourished adequately on protein and fat only—Metabolism of fasting—Why Man and other carnivores remain strong without food—

8 MAN EXPERIMENTS WITH HIS DIET, BUT
TIMIDLY (A Trifling Ecologic Readjustment) 55

Paleolithic (Old Stone Age)—Proconsul and origin of Man—Archaeology reveals diet of primitive Man—Dating archaeological artifacts—Man's diet during the Paleolithic Age—During the *Mesolithic* (Middle Stone Age)—In Eastern Mediterranean—In Jericho and Jarmo—In Southern France—In England—In Africa—In New World, Peru, American Southwest, Colorado, the Folsom culture, in California, Puget Sound, the Eskimo, Mexico—

9 A FARMER IS BORN AND INVENTS CARBOHYDRATE (A Greater Ecological Change) 69

Neolithic (New Stone Age), farming begins—The "Fertile Crescent"—Farming 7000 B.C. (crops + domestic animals)—Aridity, exhausted fields, population increase, exodus—The Indian immigrants—The Chinese contingent—The European entrants—Safari to Sweden—The British branch—Americans spurn agriculture—Unique grains of Europe, Asia, America—Cooking and pottery—Domestication of animals—A dairy industry—Cultural differentiation—The hunter-gatherers—The pastoral nomads—The hoe farmers—The field farmers—Dawn of urbanization—

10 MAN BECOMES CITIFIED, HIS DIET INDUSTRIALIZED (Human Ecology Becomes Strained) 87
Farmers put down roots—Villages appear—Labor becomes specialized—Farmers, technologists, politicians, priests—Taxes, industry, foreign trade, currency—Size of early cities—Urbania demands food processing and preservation—Pre-christian foods of Mesopotamia—Of Greece—Of Rome—Of England—Post-Rennaissance foods—Of England—Of the New World—

11 VITAMINS DISCOVERED; MAN'S DIET SUFFERS (Human Ecology Finally Fractured) 103
Foods of the United States 1900-1925—Discovery of Vitamin B₁ 1911—The impact of vitamins—On science—On business—On merchandising—Birth of “soft sell” advertising—Effect on diet—The barren Basic 7—

12 SOME MODERN STONE AGE CULTURES 115
The African Bushman—His cousin the Bambuti—The Masai and Watusi—Somaliland camel herders—The Berbers—Marsh Arabs of Mesopotamia—Nomadic Bedouins of Iraq—The Todas of India—Japanese Ainu—The Finnish Lapp—Negritos of the Philippines and Veddas of Ceylon—The Australian Aborigine—The Eskimos and North Woods Indians—Pemmican, a pure Stone Age food—Rural denizens of the world—

13 WHAT HAS EVOLUTION DONE TO US RECENTLY? 127
Has Man changed his gut design recently?—The genetic code—How and why of evolutionary change—How fast it takes place—How fast is slow?—How slow is fast?—Effect of environmental change—Size of interbreeding population—Mutations—For better or worse—Selection by chance or intent—Speed of

evolutionary change in Man—In the horse—In the dolphin—In birds—In the bear—Conclusion: Man remains a carnivore—

14 WHY CARNIVORES MUST EAT AS CARNIVORES DO 137

Fuel for engines and food for Man—Most plants indigestible by Man—What happens when he eats them—A bacterial “5th Column”—Putrefaction vs. fermentation—Acid produced in the colon—Colitis appears—Getting rid of the fermenters—Carnivores depend upon essential amino acids and animal fat—How to formulate a reasonable human diet—

15 A TWENTIETH-CENTURY STONE AGE DIET 145

Diet (A) for colitis, diarrhea, acidity, gas, indigestion—Begin with Stone Age diet, meat and fat—Add a few cooked succulents—A cooked fruit or two—Fermented milk products—Coffee, tea, alcohol—Diet (B) for obesity—Include some fodder foods—Diet (C) for permanent use—Add some grains and potato—Avoid jet action juices—Baleful salads—Sweets—Sweet milk—Some hints for dieting—

16 HUNGER AND APPETITE 159

The difference between them—Hunger is innate, an instinct—Appetite is acquired—The conditioned reflex—Laws of the conditioned reflex—The “all or none” law—It’s stronger than you are—Guidelines for dieting—

17 DIET AND FUNCTIONAL DISTRESS 169

What is functional distress? Why does it afflict us?—Role of the nervous system—The universal stimulus of fear—The spectrum of functional disorders—Constipation—Laxative colitis—Spastic or

mucus colitis—Flatulence (gas)—Heartburn and sour stomach—Bloating—What is a bland diet?—Chemical irritants—

18 DIET AND ORGANIC DISEASE

183

Diet dependent diseases—Either under-consumption of proteins or fat—Or over-consumption of carbohydrate—Rarely a lack of calories—Kwashiorkor—Mental retardation—The fatty liver and liver cirrhosis—Gallstones—Peptic ulcer—Diabetes—Hypoglycemia—Lactose intolerance—Sprue—Ulcerative colitis—Regional enteritis—Obesity—Dental caries—Intestinal parasites—Arthritis (?)—

19 FAT IS NOT A DIRTY WORD

197

What is cholesterol?—Fats, animal and plant—Arteriosclerosis and “heart attack”—Origins of the fat-cholesterol debate—Fat as an honored food—Fat hunger—Studies of fat and heart disease—Epidemiological studies—Animal studies—Clinical studies—The F.D.A. statement—More research needed—Growing concept of carbohydrate-induced rise in blood fats—Advice—

20 FOOD AND ENERGY

213

Is sugar *the* energy food?—Do carnivores get weak without sugar?—Does man?—Studies on fasting—Revised earlier thinking—The R.Q.—Muscles use glucose—But use fat better—This single fact allows survival of Man and all other carnivorous animals—

21 WHAT *ABOUT* VITAMINS?

221

Public attitude toward—Some questions—Scurvy and Vitamin C—Other vitamins—All are present in animal protein or fat—Or are synthesized by the body—Vitamins A, B₂, Niacin, B₆, folic acid, B₁₂, C, D,

E—Effect of cooking—Hypervitaminosis—“Sub-clinical vitamin deficiency” syndrome—F.T.C. statement—F.D.A. statement—

22 MALNUTRITION—PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE 237

Mesolithic calorie deficit—Hunger but no malnutrition—Normal nutrition prevailed to the time of Christ—The next 2000 years saw protein caloric malnutrition appear—20th Century malnutrition—Both caloric and protein deficiency—Scope of caloric malnutrition today—Protein caloric malnutrition today—Some tragic consequences—Retardation, physical and mental—Drain upon society—Malthusian dynamics and how they work—Our “Island in Space”—Grave threat to the future—Widespread protein malnutrition and starvation.

23 FORECASTING FUTURE FOODS 245

Augmenting agricultural yields—Plant genetics—Improved herbicides—Cheap fertilizer—Biological fertilization—Reclamation of deserts—Saline irrigation—Return to urban centers—Modified animal crops for human consumption—All gain only more calories—Remember the vital essential amino acids—Urgent need is for more animal protein—Enriched grain a partial answer—Genetic improvement of animals—Superfish—Fish farms—Proteins from the sea—Fish flour—Unconventional sea foods—The wasteful 7 for 1 biological ratio for growth—Animal plankton as human food—Domestic sea cows—Professor Virtanen’s protein from cellulose—Mechanical ruminants?—Proteins from petroleum—More from methane—Eliminate non-food herbivores or eat them—Eliminate non-human carnivores—Insects as food—A lugubrious lament—

Appendix 259

Bibliography and footnotes—books 265

INTRODUCTION

About a generation ago a strange word began to appear in scientific writings—*ecology*. This term merely meant the relationship of an organism to its environment. Since this new discipline encompassed all known information related to a given organism, as well as all facets of the environment in which the organism existed, ecology rapidly became an ultra-sophisticated science.

It is now realized that whereas the environment of an organism such as Man may change very rapidly, physical and functional changes in him are accomplished only through a process of evolution, and such adaptive alterations occur in Nature only with profound deliberation, over millions of years.

Thus we can envision a collision course existing between unchanging Man and his rapidly changing environment. The more rapid his environmental changes, the more imminent is the inevitable collision.

This book is a study of the ecology of Man, as his environment has changed with (relatively) lightning-like rapidity from prehistorical to modern times, and to delineate the effect these changes have had on human nutrition.

An attempt will be made to answer the question: "Is modern Man actually better or worse off nutritionally than was his Stone Age forbear?"

Writing this book has indeed been fun. While collecting material for the early chapters I was able to add greatly to my knowledge of comparative anatomy and physiology, how all various sorts of animals are constructed, and how their

digestive tracts function. Later chapters led me into a fascinating world of the past, of anthropology and archaeology, which I embraced enthusiastically though amateurishly. Finally I ventured into the shadowy sphere of philosophy, explored some aspects of future food production, and have set down the dire predictions of population ecologists for the arrival of the 21st century.

It has been thrilling to see how each bit of scientific data from such widely separated disciplines fitted together into a mosaic of such undeniable clarity that the aphorism: "*That contrary to Nature cannot be fact*"—was again verified, this time in the field of human dietetics and nutrition.

Inevitably, in attempting to change popular opinion on any subject, one must tread on many toes and affront many sacred cows. Such a mantle of iconoclasm rests heavily on me, for it imposes a great responsibility. In recognition of this I have attempted to fortify my position on each subject with which I have taken issue by documentary evidence. By doing so the volume has been lengthened considerably, but I have simultaneously paid tribute to my readers by not foisting upon them various concepts and beliefs unsupported except by personal professional arrogance. It has always been my doctrine that even the most unlettered deserves an explanation from which he may draw his own opinion. If his opinion is a bad one, it is the teacher's fault for not being a factual mentor.

While identification of source material is desirable, an awareness of publishing costs precludes inclusion of a formal bibliography. An acceptable substitute, I hope, has been the listing of relevant books and technical journals from which the inquiring mind may identify an authority with minimal drudgery. When technical articles have been reported in news media, magazines, or periodicals, a citation has been made for the reader's convenience.

Looming early in planning this book was the problem of selecting a format capable of achieving two objectives: (1) explanation of its content in terms sufficiently lucid for patients; and (2) inclusion of enough technical evidence to satisfy the inquiring mind of physicians.

By adopting such a technique I intend to woo a bipartite audience: physicians to examine and, I hope, accept these newer concepts of diet and nutrition, and lay persons to be guided in the dietary treatment of their own problems of nervous indigestion, functional disorders of the digestive tract, obesity, and certain other organic diseases.

I will be gratified indeed if my colleagues see fit to recommend this volume to their patients for this purpose.

It is hoped that patients will not be dismayed if they bog down while traversing sections dealing with medical sciences, and that physicians will charitably recognize and accept the degree of simplification necessary to teach lay readers, who are somewhat less scientifically erudite than are we.

If this book must be dedicated to someone, it should be to the occasional man, woman, or child who still can resist the specious authority of food merchants, their lavish advertisements and spectacular television commercials, and retain sufficient intellectual independence to think for themselves.

Seattle, Washington

Walter L. Voegtlin, M.D., F.A.C.P.

THE
STONE AGE DIET

Chapter 1

WHAT IT'S ALL ABOUT

Of course you are a human being! Everybody is.

But did you know that you are also an animal—a carnivorous animal? All humans are. Did anybody ever tell you that your ancestors were exclusively flesh-eaters for at least two and possibly twenty *million* years? Were you aware that ancestral man first departed slightly from a strictly carnivorous diet a mere ten *thousand* years ago? Well, he was and he did, and discussion of these salient points relevant to man's diet will be the first task of this book.

Over the next 9,950 years Man continued to make minor changes in his victuals as new plant substances were discovered and cultivated. These changes contributed nothing nutritionally but a more abundant supply of calories. They did promote cultural progress from feeding to eating. However, few if any of the novelties introduced to his palate during the following centuries of dietary experimentation were sufficiently indigestible, or eaten in so great a quantity, as to incite rebellion by his digestive tract. As a consequence, man continued to nibble at them and experiment cautiously with still newer foods. He gradually even grew to like some of them, especially when he was hungry and there was no meat in the larder.

Then, about a half-century ago, toward the end of World

War I, there began a strange and unnatural alteration in the human diet. This modern tampering with man's hitherto quite satisfactory diet was undertaken to improve man's hitherto quite satisfactory nutritional state. These changes were initiated by a new type of bioscientist: the nutritionist. They were soon taken over by commercial interests which, with superb subtlety, today virtually control the dietary thinking of most teachers, physicians, patients, and all of the public at large capable of reading an advertisement or viewing television. [99-4]

All this would have been quite all right had not this new and fashionable trend junked most of the foods comprising man's diet from the dawn of humanity, and substituted refined, processed, uncooked plant foods and cheap carbohydrates for the animal fats and proteins he was designed to digest most easily.

Think for a moment of the Old Stone Age people, who, when hungry, slew a cave bear or a woolly rhinoceros, gorged on a half-dozen pounds of meat and fat and, only when hungry, returned to the hunt. Then 10,000 years ago, the New Stone Age folk added to the menu—when meat and fat was in short supply—a handful of wild wheat or barley which had been well-pounded between stones and baked on a hot rock. These Stone Age diets were carnivorous—chiefly fats and protein, with only a little carbohydrate.

Compare this diet, naturally selected by man, with the food he eats today. [99-5]

Morning starts with breakfast and breakfast starts with a glass of juice, followed by some prepared cereal shaken into a bowl, liberally laced with sugar (for energy), doused with milk (for more energy) and gulped while reading the morning paper. Toast with margarine and jelly and coffee complete the meal. Eggs, meat, bacon or other animal proteins for breakfast are costly, difficult to prepare, and are discouraged as unnecessary by the people who manufacture cereals. [73-1] [73-2] [74-15]

By ten o'clock the charge of breakfast energy has somehow dribbled away and a coffee break is necessary. Foods then consumed include doughnuts, sweet rolls, candy bars, soft drinks, raw fruits, fruit juice, milk, or malted milk.

At luncheon people peruse the menu listlessly, for they are not hungry. Yet they are tired, so they choose some soup with little or no meat in it, and a sandwich with a thin sliver of meat, cheese, or tuna fish, hidden between two thick slices of bread. Accompanying this is either a tossed salad or French fried potatoes. The meal ends with dessert (pie, cake, pudding, ice cream), a glass of milk or coffee.

After school, small fry are fed raw fruits, carrot and celery sticks, milk, soft drinks, fruit juices, cookies, or bread and jam.

Dinner traditionally begins with a tossed salad. The average meat serving is modest and is often replaced with baked beans, macaroni and cheese, soy bean meat substitutes, or peanut butter. An array of vegetables is dwarfed by a mountain of mashed potatoes and gravy or a giant baked potato. Most families have bread or rolls with butter at dinner. Dessert is about the same as lunch, only more of it.

Dinner moves almost without interruption to the television room, where popcorn, peanuts, crackers, potato chips, soft drinks, beer, and perhaps a little cheese keep the family occupied until bedtime.

Score for the day? A great deal of carbohydrate (much of it indigestible) and very little animal protein (four ounces or less). [91-15]

Today's "balanced" diet is color-coded: a green and a yellow vegetable together with most anything else seems to be suitable. One dares not have two starchy vegetables at the same meal, but multiple sources of other carbohydrates are fine. Fried foods are out but charcoal-charred steaks are in. Anything that cannot easily be smashed between thumb and forefinger is harsh and irritating, but fibrous vegetables may be eaten raw with impunity and with no particular logic. Animal fats, vitamins and roughage are removed from our foods and vegetable oils, synthetic vitamins and expensive bulking agents are used to replace them. People flood themselves with eight glasses of water daily, then go to the doctor for treatment of a weak bladder. Without orange juice one fears he will get scurvy (or at least a bad cold); without milk the bones will soften and the teeth decay; without sugar we get tired and have no energy. Jews proscribe pork,

Seventh-Day Adventists shun all animal flesh, vegetarians eschew animal proteins of any sort, the naturist tries to eat all his foods raw, and the Millerite rejects vegetables grown with artificial fertilizer. Breakfast is the most important meal of the day for Americans but not for Europeans. Fat is anathema in the United States but honored in England, Norway, Australia, Somaliland and the Arctic. Without food we lack stamina, yet the athlete still enters a contest with no food at all in his stomach, and the bank president still gets tired even though he eats sufficient food to be forty pounds overweight.

Our foods are chemically preserved, sweetened, colored and flavored; they are canned, dehydrated, frozen, pasteurized, Fletcherized, fortified, ground, juiced, instantized, Osterized, precooked, prepackaged, pureed, pickled, salted, strained, and swallowed whole. In short, everything is being done to our modern diet but keep it digestible: high in animal proteins and fats and low in carbohydrates.

Without doubt a few centuries have seen radical changes in Man's diet. Now we must pause to examine whether we have been traveling in the right direction. There is much evidence that says we have not. Many of Man's physical discomforts and health problems can be traced to his modern, highly scientific, yet faulty diet. The evidence is incontestable that Man's foods still should be those he naturally selected and even today digests with greatest ease—protein and fat with little or no carbohydrate.

Presenting this evidence will be the second task of this book.

Choosing proper foods for people merely means selecting not only the nutritive material that is best suited for the growth, energy, repair, and maintenance of the vital processes in humans, but also what is most easily digested by them. The third task of this book is to show how proper food selection can accomplish both, while simultaneously avoiding some of the organic diseases and all of the functional digestive distress our modern life and diet thrusts upon us.

The fourth task is to explain how modern humans can partake of a high protein-fat diet right now, and will also discuss certain measures that will be necessary to insure a

continued abundance of these benevolent nutriments, as the organisms living upon this earth continue to expand while our globe itself does not.

Chapter 2

LOW CARBOHYDRATE—AN OLD “NEW DEPARTURE” DIET

The low carbohydrate diet is an old diet. It was the choice of man for two million Stone Age years. He first departed from his meat-fat diet only a few thousand years ago. This was partly because of an increasing population. More important were climatic changes which decimated the large game animals, his chief source of food. Strictly from hunger, man began to eat some plant substances which were, of course, carbohydrate.

Once man had departed from his meat-fat diet he gradually added still other carbohydrate substances. He stopped eating from hunger and began eating for fun. As carbohydrate foods became more prominent he suffered certain consequences from his dietetic tampering, not the least of which was obesity. The first feeble effort to reform these bad dietetic habits occurred only about a century ago.

At that time an English physician named Harvey prescribed for a Mr. Banting, whose corpulence had successfully resisted all previous efforts to regain normal proportions, a low carbohydrate diet.[9]

Since there are only three food substances—protein, fat and carbohydrate—Dr. Harvey’s prescribed diet must have consisted chiefly of protein and fat.

It was a Stone Age diet!

Mr. Banting's weight loss was spectacular. He joyfully embarked on a one-man crusade to slim his overweight countrymen by publishing, at his own expense, a pamphlet which was promptly arrogated by the pompous practicing physicians of the day. Banting, disillusioned by his role of messiah of the overweight, sadly buried his pamphlets, which he could no longer even give away, and eventually died an embittered, albeit a thin, old man.

Except for occasional timid suggestions that excess carbohydrate was inimical to health, which appeared sporadically on back pages of the British and American Medical Association journals, the concept of a low carbohydrate nutritional regimen lay quietly interred until in 1949 Dr. A. W. Pennington described a similar diet used to control obesity. [72-1] Because the diet emanated from the medical staff of E. I. duPont de Nemours and Company, the epithet "du Pont diet" was applied, and subsequently changed to the "Holiday" diet, after being widely publicized in that magazine. Although the diet was admittedly harmless, and also successful in slimming the overweight, the idea expired about 1955, the *coup de grâce* again being administered by prejudiced physicians.

A few years later another English physician, Dr. Richard Mackarness, [11] exhumed the low carbohydrate diet, dusted it off, examined it, and found it to be good. Both Pennington and Mackarness advocated the diet solely as a treatment for obesity, completely unaware of its vastly greater value in ameliorating functional digestive distress, those extremely discomfiting maladies which plague nervous people, yet which have no actual disease state at all to cause them!

About this time others began to show increasing interest in the low carbohydrate scheme of dietetics. Support came from non-medical sources, such as Arctic explorer Vilhjalmur Stefansson [24] [41], who showed that under the most adverse circumstances both primitive Eskimo and modern man, of all races, can subsist admirably for years on no food but meat, fish and fat. Close observation by physicians confirmed the truth of Stefansson's observation. [74-1] Bradford Angier in 1956 wrote extensively on survival in the wilderness, [22]

noting that fresh meat was a complete diet in itself. It afforded all the food ingredients even though nothing was ingested other than rare steaks for week after month after year.

Documented instances of long-term survival in the wilderness with no food except game animals are too many to enumerate.

A West Coast gastroenterologist (a physician specializing in diseases of the digestive tract) [83-1] points out that man is carnivorous, not only by nature but as proven by the structure of his digestive tract. Over the centuries ideas concerning man's diet have been influenced by folklore and tradition, much of which is not reasonable or sensible. One of these is the belief that plant substances are more digestible and therefore more beneficial to the human digestive tract than is meat and fat.

An East Coast clinician and nutritionist [91-2] and a Georgia research director consider the high protein-low carbohydrate diet effective as well as safe for weight reduction. Another Eastern research clinician remarks that the beginning of agriculture eight to ten thousand years ago, which changed man's diet from one composed chiefly of protein and fat to one made up largely of carbohydrate, was unfortunate. [60-1] A Midwest physician prescribed a low carbohydrate diet as best for obesity [74-5], and a Southern wrestler reduced from 802 to 227 pounds, finding a protein diet the most effective. [108-1]

Just reported in the daily press is the experience of a world-renowned television personality who lost 61 pounds of his rotundity in 6 months while subsisting on meat, fish and eggs, the only vegetable material consumed being the olives from his martinis.

Professor Yudkin [76-1] of the University of London and Queen Elizabeth's Hospital finds that unlimited protein and fat with little or no carbohydrate is more effective in causing weight loss than is caloric restriction or starving.

My own concept of the human diet was shaped in the physiology research laboratory while working with the dog, a carnivorous animal whose digestive tract is remarkably similar to man's. It was proved there that the dog fared

best when fed meat and fat with very little—if any—carbohydrate. Years later, as a practicing physician, my dietary advice to humans suffering from functional digestive complaints was the same—protein and fat with little or no carbohydrate. [79-1] Such an attitude was published in 1939. Continued use of such a diet has not lessened my regard for it, and has converted many colleagues and patients to similar views.

Thus it may be seen that the concept of low carbohydrate nutrition does not spring from one man's mind alone; neither is it a product of medical or biological immaturity. While the low carbohydrate diet is indubitably effective as well as logical for reducing (did you ever see a fat tiger?) a greater value is found in its use for restoring health and comfort to the myriad unhappy humans who suffer from nervous indigestion and even some organic diseases.

The reason for its salutary effect in functional conditions (mucus or spastic colitis, gas, heartburn, chronic diarrhea, irritable colon, etc., etc.) is simple. Emotional stress, as is universally known, markedly decreases the alimentary tract's ability to perform its function, that of digesting food. Therefore, when under nervous tension, it is only reasonable that food be restricted to that most easily assimilated—protein and fat with little or no carbohydrate.

To the rugged character who cheerfully digests everything he may wish to eat, this book is offered simply as interesting reading. However, should he critically examine his digestive functions, it may be discovered that gas, heartburn, frequent explosive bowel motions, bloating, and vague abdominal discomforts, previously considered as normal annoyances, are actually the protestings of a digestive tract that is being abused.

Today's ultra-sophisticated diet seems to indicate that man now requires an unfailing source of greatly varied and specific foods from far and near. In addition man must, apparently, possess a vast nutritional knowledge in order to choose wisely the great variety of vital substances his body is said to need. A friend once asked a noted nutritionist what substances were really necessary to stay healthy. [21]

Her amazing reply:

"Fresh orange juice and yeast and/or liver daily for Vitamins C and B, and yogurt almost daily, is needed to supply bacteria to produce Vitamin K and still more Vitamin B. In addition 25,000 units of Vitamin D is taken every Saturday. Nervousness requires calcium and Vitamin B₆ and lost sleep and cold more Vitamin C. For gas, lemon juice, hydrochloric acid, or glutamic acid and digestive enzymes with bile salts were advised. To combat fatigue a concoction of milk, powdered skim milk, brewer's yeast, soy flour, orange juice (or apricot, grape, banana, pineapple, berries or blackstrap molasses) was recommended. A cup of yogurt with fresh or dried liver could be substituted. Lobster, because it contains glycogen, was advocated as an energy food. Nourishment should be taken every two hours to avoid fatigue."

Were these multiple dietary requirements really necessary to maintain a state of health, man, in his restricted and rigorous primordial environment, obviously would have succumbed many milleniums before even the dawn of civilization.

Why, then, should modern man, in his salubrious surroundings, require more complicated nutriments than his primitive ancestors?

Hippocrates, the Father of Medicine, believed devoutly in a powerful governing principle which he called *Nature*. Leclerc [43] in his *History of Physick* superbly describes this indispensible governor:

"*Nature* is of itself sufficient to every animal, and that in all respects. She performs everything that is necessary to them, without needing the least instruction from anyone how to do it—that is the faculty which gives nourishment, preservation and growth to all things."

Thus, wild animals do not require instruction or frequent bulletins from the Department of Agriculture to guide

them in their choice of food. The grazing animals seek and eat plant food; the carnivorous animals hunt and devour the plant eaters. It's as simple as that, and the wild animals are perfect examples of optimum nutrition resulting from their respective balanced diets.

Since man also was a dumb animal for a million or so years before he began to acquire the doubtful assets of civilization, it is certain that *Nature* also gave to him a similar innate wisdom to choose foods best suited for his digestive tract. Fortunately we know exactly what prehistoric man ate. It was meat and fat. So long as he remained stupid and uninformed he did a creditable job of selecting his diet. As he gained a little knowledge of farming, he began to stray from his narrow dietetic path, but not very far. As his knowledge grew he began to stray farther, beginning to penetrate into the fringes of a dietetic jungle. Today, at the pinnacle of his knowledge and intelligence, he has arrived at a point where he can split the atom, land men on the moon and "create babies in test tubes," yet he has lost the innate instinct to choose those foods proper for his gullet and reject those not suitable.

Modern society eats those viands which, we are told from all sides, constitute the finest diet in the history of man's existence, yet which, according to the laws of nature, anatomy, and physiology, are poorly suited to the human digestive tract. That the latter is indeed the fact may be suspected from the plethora of dietetic pamphlets, treatises, books, and lectures, many of which learnedly proffer information diametrically opposed to many equally learned others. This spate of dietetic literature would be pointless if everyone were satisfied with his diet and if no one were searching for an obesity cure or relief from a bellyache.

That people are doing exactly that is attested to by the increasing number who suffer from functional indigestion and almost daily present themselves to yet another physician in search of relief from abdominal pain—patients with very real distress but no disease to cause it.

Many of the scientifically based facts presented in this book will shock readers steeped in popular dietetic lore alone. It is only fair that an attempt be made to guide them

out of the morass in which they are entrapped, by explaining the technical reasons why today's diet is not as it should be for the nutrition of human beings.

First, we will consider the matter of diet philosophically, then examine the anatomy (structure) and physiology (function) of man's digestive tract. Description of the sub-human forms of mammalian life will be made to establish the fact that within this class of animals, two separate and distinctive types of digestive tracts occur. Each requires an equally separate and distinctive type of diet. Comparison will then be made for the purpose of identifying man's alimentary apparatus with one or the other type, and not to form a flimsy postulate of similarity upon which to hang an equally frivolous dietary notion.

It must never be assumed that the digestive tracts of all the different animals, merely because they possess stomach, intestine, liver and pancreas in common, must all be obligated to obediently digest and assimilate the same foods with equal facility.

The results of observation and experiments done on the lower animals can never be considered *in toto* as applying also to man, until the same experiment has been repeated on man and found to give the same results. Disregarding this basic fact of biological research in a frenetic effort to prove something or other has been responsible for the birth of nutritional ideas almost ludicrous in their misapplication to man.

Now that you have learned something about the diet you will be following, it is suggested that you skip to Chapter 15, familiarize yourself with the Stone Age diet, and get started on it.

The reason?

Simply that by the time you have read the intervening chapters and learned *why* you are on the diet, you will already have seen how it works and will have begun to reap the benefits of proper eating and nutrition!

Chapter 3

A PHILOSOPHER CHOOSES HIS DIET

Philosophizing—the simple process of sitting down and thinking about something—is the first step in making a discovery.

In olden times philosophers were omniscient, that is, they knew everything about everything. There was not a great deal to know about any one science and it was possible for a single brain to possess comprehensive knowledge in all branches of learning. Therefore a philosopher could voice an opinion which might or might not be a fact but which could not be disputed for lack of a more learned disputant.

As a consequence, philosophic postulates (assumptions without proof) were of necessity accepted as facts.

Since then, specialized knowledge of specific matters has grown so rapidly that man found it impossible to know everything about everything. Scholars became specialists in the various sciences such as engineering, medicine, geology, physics, etc., and as the great mass of learning expanded further and further, eventually were forced to subspecialize in each specific science, such as electrical engineering, surgery, petroleum geology, nuclear physics, and such. A single brain could no longer sit down, focus its full intelligence upon a problem, and come up with a new fact. It became necessary to add other steps to a philosophic postulate

before it could be considered to be a fact, and thus eligible to become a part of man's store of learning. Only in this way could knowledge avoid becoming fouled with false beliefs, superstitions, and inaccurate teachings, with scholarly bedlam resulting.

Today a process of discovery consists of several separate steps:

- 1 Taking into consideration all the information a researcher (philosopher) possesses on a subject to see if it forms a *theory*.
2. Collecting from the literature and teachings of others all the information known on the subject to see if it is compatible with the theory and allows a *postulate*.
3. The researcher must then prove his postulate by moving into the laboratory, devising experimental methods, and thus proving by actual measurement or demonstration the validity of his postulate. He then makes known his findings by publishing a thesis.
4. If the research work is well-conceived and accurately performed, the results will be reproducible by others.

The first of these four steps might be called "armchair" philosophizing, for one need not depart from his armchair to do it. The second step is literary research and requires many hours in the library searching and reading. Unfortunately, everything that is published is not necessarily factual. The researcher must be most critical in judging the merit of each article, particularly its freedom from bias, the professional stature of its author, and whether the work has been confirmed by others.

The third step, laboratory research, demands a meticulous design and careful elimination of any element which might lead to an erroneous conclusion. Such a defect in design, fatal to a valid conclusion, would be the use of a rabbit as the experimental animal in determining how well man digests alfalfa, or how rapidly he deposits fat in his arteries.

It might be of interest to trace from first inception to present cataclysmic crescendo what started as a philosophic postulate, was subsequently revised because it was not in

agreement with later additional learning, and finally was expanded by succeeding scientists into what has become the greatest force ever controlled by man.

Up to 1675 philosophers believed the passage of light to be instantaneous. This philosophic postulate appeared valid since the speed of light, as we now know, is far too rapid to be measured by any crude method then in existence.

However in 1676 a Dane, Olaus Römer, at the age of thirty-two began to doubt these teachings of Aristotle, because he had observed the disappearance and reappearance of the four moons of Jupiter and noted a time discrepancy which depended upon the relative position of his observation post, the Earth, to that distant planet. He calculated from his philosophizing that light was not instantaneous but did travel very rapidly, at a speed of about 150,000 miles per second.

Thus was a process of learning and discovery initiated by discrediting a dogma supported by nothing more than "armchair" philosophizing.

Römer's conclusion was still merely a postulate, for it lacked any actual physical measurement to validate it. To devise a suitable experiment was far beyond the skill of seventeenth-century physicists, and it was not until two centuries later that such proof was furnished by a young Naval officer, Albert P. Michelson, who, working in collaboration with an equally astute physicist, Edward Morley, effectively disproved the theory of a "stationary ether" as the medium through which light waves were propagated, and they succeeded in actually measuring the speed of light. By the measurements of Michelson and Morley light was shown to travel at a velocity of 186,000 miles per second, a value not greatly different from Römer's calculation.

Experiments dealing with the nature of light and the physical laws governing its behavior became, from this point, more and more complex, until soon they were comprehended by only a very few of the most erudite scientists. From somewhere among this scientific welter emerged an innocuous equation— $E = mc^2$ —purporting to predict that, theoretically, immeasurable energy could be obtained from a minute amount of matter. Followed the theory of relativity

of Albert Einstein, after which a tremendous amount of experimental study proved his philosophic postulate to be scientific fact when, in 1945, the first atomic bomb was triggered in New Mexico.

Had Aristotle never philosophized concerning the nature of light, the Atomic Age would still be in the future. Herein lies the need for basic philosophy; discovery will never be made unless some person begins to think about something.

However, had the philosopher's false postulate gone without challenge and correction, and if modern professors were still teaching students that the passage of light was instantaneous, the Atomic Age would still lie centuries in the future. Herein lies the danger of blindly accepting "armchair" philosophy, of stopping after Step 1, of accepting as truth that which may have the sound and appearance of fact but is actually only an unproved theory.

Much of the literature concerning diet consists of this same unconfirmed "armchair" philosophy or, equally bad, a misapplication to man of scientific facts that relate only to the lower animals. We all tend to cling to beliefs that were once accepted but have since been invalidated by more careful study, and we accept the results of poorly controlled and unconfirmed laboratory experimentation at its face value just because it has appeared in print somewhere.

In reading technical material the tyro may be unable to distinguish fact from theory, or recognize as such the philosophic postulates often associated with advertising, social usage, food fadism, religious dogma, etc.; he must therefore unwittingly dilute his knowledge with a great many popular concepts which are, for the most part, mere educational dross.

That such happens with distressful frequency is attested to by the number of bizarre dietary notions and beliefs revealed to the physician by his patients.

Now, bearing in mind the dangers and limitations of philosophic opinion unsupported by scientific fact, it should be permissible to proceed with some considerations of our basic question: "What is the proper food for man; is he herbivore or carnivore?" Let us see how a philosopher would choose his diet.

If reference is made to an early twentieth-century edition of the *Seattle Star* newspaper, an item concerning a certain hunter may be read. It merely stated that he had gone into the mountainous wilds then surrounding Seattle in quest of deer. He was not heard of again, that is until an engineering crew, surveying a new trans-state highway, came upon a skeleton ultimately identified as the hapless hunter of the old news item. His story, scrawled on a scrap of paper and preserved in a tobacco can, told in meager detail of his loss of pack, compass, ammunition, matches, and food in a mountain torrent, of his blind wanderings and eventual slow demise by starvation.

Such an end is not surprising; it happens every day someplace in the world, that man—stranded amid lush vegetation—should starve, while plant-eating animals prosper, becoming fatter and stronger. Volumes have been written on the extreme difficulties of survival under similar circumstances, when man is deprived of all food except that which is manifestly adequate for the grazing animals of the forests and plains.

From this philosophical starting point a reasonable theory could be formed: there are two sorts of animals: those who can subsist adequately on plant life alone, and those who cannot.

Common knowledge supports this theory that some animals—the cow, horse, sheep—can live and grow fat while confined in a field of grass; other animals—dog, cat, tiger—would succumb to starvation if similarly confined. [12]

For centuries bioscience has recognized this basic difference between plant eaters and flesh eaters. The former have been named herbivore; the latter, carnivore.

Starvation might force a limited departure from this natural diet of each, but if this occurs, digestion and absorption are difficult and inefficient, as well as uncomfortable to the animal. Nutrition is improved but little, and the animal is not well. Today other factors, such as availability, cost, convenience, and various commercial and economic reasons, have corrupted the diet of domestic animals as well as of man himself. As an example, consider the modern diet of the dog, a natural carnivore. If he is a valuable show animal, a

racing, sled, police, cart dog or a hunter, he is fed—for the most part—a pure animal protein diet with added fat. He remains sleek, strong, active, alert, tireless—and thin. His stools are small and compact with scarcely any odor. If he is merely a tolerated member of the household he gets table scraps, or cheaper grades of commercial dog foods containing much cereal or vegetable material but little animal protein. On such a diet the animal gets fat, dull, short of breath, and prefers to spend his time drowsing in the sun or before the radiator. He has gas, and his stools are bulky, amorphous and foul. This dog's master, who ate this same food before it became table scraps, is apt to resemble his pet in many ways.

In addition to herbivores and carnivores, there is a third and smaller group called omnivores. While these animals generally resemble the flesh eaters, each has one or more distinctly herbivorous appendages to the digestive tract. These may be thought of as transitional forms in an evolutionary process between a carnivorous ancestor and an ultimate herbivorous descendent, or possibly vice versa. It is of interest that while omnivores are predominantly flesh eaters, they shift to a herbivorous diet in order to acquire body fat prior to hibernation.

There are two fundamental differences between the herbivore and carnivore:

1. Herbivorous animals can digest and utilize as food the plant substance cellulose. [49] Carnivorous animals cannot.
2. Herbivorous animals can live normally from the time they are weaned until their death without ingesting animal proteins of any sort. Carnivorous animals cannot.

These universally accepted biological facts dictate the basic scheme of Nature: that herbivores eat the plants, while carnivores eat the herbivores. Without the interposition of plant-eating animals to change vegetation to animal proteins, carnivorous life could not have existed for a single generation, let alone for millions of years.

Cellulose is the basic material of all plant life. It forms the framework of the plant and the walls of each plant cell. When cellulose is treated with strong acids and pressed into sheets it becomes paper, such as that upon which these words are printed. It is not a comic strip joke that the goat, for instance, can eat and digest paper. [85-4] The herbivorous animal possesses special biochemical processes within its digestive tract making possible the digestion and utilization of cellulose. The carnivorous animal is devoid of any similar mechanism. If cellulose is ingested by the grazing animal, it is a food substance. If it is ingested by the flesh eater, it passes through the entire digestive apparatus unchanged and is expelled as waste.

This inability of carnivorous animals to digest cellulose has led to the concoction of a novel dietetic "food" which cannot fatten the human, because it is made almost entirely of this substance. [106-1] Since cellulose provides no nourishment to man, he must be categorized as a carnivorous animal.

Plant materials contain substances other than cellulose. Plant starch and sugar, some vegetable protein, and fats are contained within each vegetable cell which, it is to be remembered, has an intact encompassing wall composed of cellulose. Most of the plant cells which contain nutriments are concentrated within the fruits, seeds or roots, each of which is composed of billions of the microscopic-sized plant cells. While these nutriments are readily utilizable by the herbivore, which has the ability to dissolve the cellulose envelope of the plant cell, they cannot be used by the carnivore, who cannot dissolve this cellulose envelope and thus expose the nutriments to digestion by its digestive juices. In order for carnivores to utilize plant starch, plant protein, or plant fat, the material must be processed before ingestion. This processing is, of course, done only by man. Thus, wild carnivores can gain no nourishment from plant material, while those living symbiotically with man may do so. This is the reason our hunter, with no means to process the plant foods about him, and lacking the strength and skill to catch and kill game, starved to death in the woods.

The hunter must have been a carnivore!

Processing of plant food to make it nutritious for carnivores usually consists of the application of moist heat, which softens the cellulose wall and causes the contained material to swell with the desired rupturing of the cell wall. Being of microscopic size, the individual plant cells are far too minute to be mechanically fractured by even the most assiduous chewing effort, or the finest grinding possible by the most modern of mills.

The fact that modern man, under certain circumstances, can stay alive with only modest amounts of animal proteins in his diet, merely demonstrates the skill he has acquired in processing plant substances to make them of some nutritive value to him. It does not demonstrate that man is not a natural carnivore. It does not show that he can digest cellulose, or that he can exist without animal proteins. It does not prove that he can digest any other food as easily and efficiently as animal protein and fat. It does not prove man's normal diet to be plant food any more than the fact that he can learn to swim proves his normal environment to be the sea.

There is a dietary cult—the vegetarian—which seems to contradict the foregoing philosophy. Dr. H. S. Glasschieb [45] traces the practice of vegetarianism in his book, *Das Labyrinth der Medizin*.

In about 100 B.C., living on the Isle of Rhodes was one Poseidonius, who maintained that cooking was not at all necessary in the preparation of food for human consumption. Chewing alone was all that was needed. Whether philosopher Poseidonius limited his foods to raw vegetable material is not clear. At any event he became notorious for his wont of strolling about, vigorously masticating all sorts of roots, legumes, and assorted plant materials. As evidence of his health-giving regimen, he achieved the age of eighty-four. His fame was somewhat tarnished, however, when the alcoholic poet Anacreon, famed for debauchery, gluttony, and avoidance of fodder foods in any form, lived to be eighty-five.

Actually the tenets of Poseidonius were not so much those of vegetarianism as of modern-day Horace Fletcher, who promised radiant health to those willing to chew each mouthful of food tirelessly.

Through the years various groups of fanatics have attempted to follow the precepts of Nietzsche by traveling to remote desert isles to live on pure vegetable diets. Such efforts have always been marked by indigestion and death to the more zealous of the participants in the experiment.

Eventually vegetarianism—as we know it today—emerged and divided into two groups: the free vegetarians who refrain from eating meat but do partake of animal protein such as eggs, cheese, milk, gelatin, broths and extracts. These are the vegetarians we know today. The orthodox vegetarian, who eschews all varieties of animal proteins and in addition eats all his foods raw, is either non-existent or follows his diet only intermittently, for he could survive no longer in the wilderness than you or I.

Careless reporting is responsible for many stories of vegetarianism which have no basis of truth. Such is the story, coming out of the Himalayas, of the Hunza people, a mountain tribe numbering ten thousand, who subsisted almost entirely on roots and berries. Other reports, however, [7] [23] are quite different and describe a respectable agriculture and animal husbandry, with abundant dairy products and the eating of meat on feast days, quite different from living off "roots and berries."

Another matter that should be disposed of at this time is the subject of primate diets. Many believe that because man and monkey belong to the same order, they should eat the same foods.

The puerile syllogism that 1) man descended from apes; 2) apes eat coconuts; therefore 3) man should eat coconuts, impelled German August Engelhart [45] to gather about him a group of disciples dedicated to eating nothing but coconuts. The community migrated to and became established on a South Pacific atoll. A fanatical disciplinarian, Engelhart decreed imprisonment and torture for those deviating in the slightest from the coconut diet. When the atoll was captured by the British during World War I only one survivor of the company was found—Engelhart himself—his legs swollen from starvation and his body a mass of putrid ulcers. He died shortly after being taken from the atoll with its abundant fish and shellfish population, which could have saved

all the "cocovores" from protein malnutrition and death.

There are many reasons why the foods of man, apes, and monkeys should differ. To begin with, many monkeys are carnivorous [108-7], subsisting on insects, small rodents, eggs, birds, grubs, and snakes. [23] [42] Studies of comparative anatomy further demonstrate the digestive tract of some monkeys and apes resembles that of the horse, [31] or in a few instances that of the cow, [44] [96-19] rather than that of carnivorous animals and man.

The philosopher has by now drawn some tentative opinions regarding the digestive potential of man's alimentary tract. He is quite sure he is not herbivorous, and it is doubtful if he is omnivorous. Therefore he is probably carnivorous, and best designed to subsist on carnivorous foods—meat and fat. Man can probably gain some nourishment from certain plant foods, provided he is able to process them in such a way that he is able to digest and absorb them.

Let us pursue this philosophical postulate further.

Since grazing animals have a much more complicated digestive chore to accomplish, it is reasonable that their digestive structures should be much more complex than those of the carnivore.

We will proceed to examine first the digestive tract of a carnivore familiar to all of us, then compare it with that of a less well-known herbivore, to ascertain if there really is a marked difference in structure and function between the two. We will then compare the human digestive apparatus with both to see which one it most closely resembles—the carnivore or the herbivore.

Chapter 4

A DOG

Since it is easier to begin any task with its simplest component, a comparison of man's digestive tract with that of the meat eater and that of the grazing animal, respectively, we will begin with the former, a carnivorous animal: the dog.

The digestive tracts of all carnivores are remarkably similar in structure and function. If one could be plucked from its nest in the abdomen and stretched out full length, one could see that it was rather short, being only about six times the animal's body length.

It is composed of an uninterrupted tube, enlarged in certain areas, to which are appended certain solid organs, the glands of digestion. The dimensions of this tube will of course vary with the size of the animal. Since we plan to make comparison eventually with man, a carnivorous animal of relative size will be described. Such an animal would be a large dog—a Great Dane or a Saint Bernard—which frequently attains a weight of 150 pounds, and has other measurements comparable to a human.

Let us start with the mouth. First we would encounter the jaws, set with incisor, canine, and molar teeth. The dog possesses incisor teeth in both upper and lower jaws. The jaw movements are up and down which, together with the ridged character of the molar teeth, indicate a tearing or crushing function rather than that of grinding or mastication. The salivary glands do not have an important digestive function

in the dog, serving merely to lubricate the chunks of meat this animal normally "wolfs," or swallows whole.

Food, when swallowed, enters the esophagus, a tube-like structure which extends from the mouth through the chest to the stomach. When distended with food, peristaltic waves are set up in the esophagus which gradually "milk" the food into the stomach. The Great Dane's stomach is rather small, having a capacity of only two quarts or less. It is the only bulbous enlargement encountered along the alimentary way. When distended it has somewhat the shape of a small football, and its size indicates the amount of food the animal can ingest at one time without discomfort. The chief functions of the carnivorous stomach are: 1) to serve as a reservoir; and 2) to dissolve the aliment (ingested food), which greatly facilitates its complete and rapid digestion as it passes down the intestine. The reservoir function allows the animal to eat a fairly large volume of food at one time. Since the food of these animals is normally meat and fat—highly concentrated foods of small bulk—sufficient amounts may be ingested at intervals of once daily to serve their nutritional needs.

Dissolving the meat and fat in the stomach is possible because this organ has the ability to manufacture and secrete into its lumen a strong mineral acid called hydrochloric acid. This same material, under the name of muriatic acid, is used widely in industry as a solvent of many substances, including metals, minerals, and organic material. Foodstuffs are held back in the stomach until solution has occurred. The solubility of different materials varies widely and as a consequence, some foods leave the stomach quickly, while others are retained for a longer period. Some insoluble substances, such as cellulose, large pieces of bone and cartilage, or raw vegetable material, if it should be ingested, are eventually emptied into the small intestine and pass through the remainder of the tract unchanged. If they are too large to pass through the exit from the stomach they are vomited.

The carnivorous stomach, which has been filled with its normal ration of meat and fat, will be able to dissolve the entire meal and evacuate it into the small intestine within three hours. The stomach then enters a period of rest until the next meal is eaten.

The dissolved food, called *chyme*, is fed into the upper end of the small intestine in a series of small spurts under the control of the *pylorus*, a muscular valve separating the stomach from the intestine.

Very little actual digestion of food occurs in the carnivorous stomach. There is some slight breaking down of highly emulsified fats, such as cream, and insignificant digestion of some protein by the pepsin of the gastric juice. In the carnivore the stomach is not a vital organ; the animal gets along quite well even though much, or even all, of its functions has been lost through disease or surgical removal.

Food leaving the stomach enters the small intestine and begins a most eventful journey through the remainder of the digestive tract.

The diameter of the small intestine is similar to that of the esophagus—about the size of a garden hose. Its length is difficult to determine with accuracy, since this dimension depends largely upon the state of its contraction or relaxation. If the small bowel (or intestine) is completely relaxed, as after death, it may be stretched out for thirty feet. Contrariwise, if a rubber tube is fed through the small intestine of a living animal, the leading tip of the tube will have traversed its entire length by the time scarcely ten feet of the tube have entered the mouth. The true functional length of our dog's small bowel is thought by most anatomists to be about twenty feet.

However, this is a most important twenty feet, for it is during transit through this portion of the tract that virtually all digestion and absorption of food must occur. The small intestine is a vital organ, for no carnivore can live without it.

Several inches from the stomach a duct or tube enters the small intestine from the side. About an inch from its point of entry into the bowel, this tube branches; the shorter branch leads to the pancreas, and the longer leads to the liver. These are the digestive glands which furnish the digestive juices to the alimentary tract. They are of vital importance to the carnivore. The gallbladder is a sac-like structure attached to and communicating with the tube leading from the liver to the intestine (bile duct). The gallbladder is

well-developed and functions strongly in all carnivores.

The presence of the first few spurts of chyme in the duodenum, or first division of the small intestine, alerts chemical sensors or *hormones*. These stimulate the production of digestive enzymes by the pancreas, which are in turn emptied into the intestine through the pancreatic duct. There they mingle with the chyme and immediately begin to break it down into its component parts. These chemical processes are continued as the chyme moves down the digestive tract, so that by the time it has reached the distal end of the small bowel, virtually all the material that can be digested has been absorbed from the digestive tube, leaving only a small indigestible residue to be emptied as a liquid suspension into the colon or large intestine for disposal as waste.

The process of digesting the food by pancreatic juice is most important because meat, fat, or carbohydrate cannot be absorbed by the small intestine as such. First they must be broken down into their basic components, the only forms in which they can be assimilated.

Proteins are broken down into a variety of amino acids, fats to fatty acids and glycerol, and digestible carbohydrates to glucose. The action of the pancreatic juice and a few weak and inconstant intestinal enzymes, constitute the entire digestive potential of the carnivorous animal. These enzymes are all produced by the animal itself. This point is of great importance, as will be seen when the carnivorous and herbivorous digestive mechanisms are compared.

Meanwhile, back in the duodenum, other activities have taken place. Certain other hormones are produced which increase the muscular activities of the intestine, and produce mixing and churning movements which facilitate digestion by the enzymes. Since digestion by enzymes takes place on the surface of the material, the process is greatly facilitated if the size of the food particles are reduced by chewing, grinding, powdering, or—most ideally of all—by actually dissolving it. Thus, the stomach's function of dissolving food before it enters the intestine, makes chewing or other processing of the normal carnivorous diet of meat and fat virtually unnecessary.

The digestion of fat requires some special handling by

the alimentary system. It has been shown that digestion occurs efficiently only when the aliment has been dissolved before being exposed to the assault of the enzymes. Fat, however, will not dissolve in water. Bile, which is manufactured by the liver, contains certain substances called bile salts, which act very much like modern laundry detergents to render fats soluble in the watery chyme, and thus render them susceptible to the action of fat-digesting enzymes.

Fat in the carnivorous diet is present in large amounts on occasions and, since the need for bile is limited to times when there is considerable fat in the diet, the bile is not allowed to drain off, to be wasted during the interdigestive periods (between meals) of the carnivorous animals. Instead it is diverted to the gallbladder, where it is concentrated and stored until the presence of fat in the intestine again signals the need for its presence, whereupon a hormone, produced by the presence of fat in the intestine, causes the gallbladder to contract strongly and deliver great amounts of concentrated bile to the intestine.

Digestion and absorption of the normal carnivorous diet—protein and fat with but little carbohydrate—is remarkably efficient. If "balance studies" are accomplished, which will merely measure the amount of a certain nutrient administered in the diet, and then determine how much of that same material appears in the animal's excreta, it is found that the healthy animal never loses more than 4% of the ingested fat and only a trace of dietary protein.

The distal end of the dog's small intestine terminates by emptying into the large intestine, or colon. This connection between the two is of an "end to side" sort; that is, they join each other at a right angle. In the dog there is here a blind pouch, or cul-de-sac, which is two or three inches in length and is called the *cecum*. While the cecum is functionless in carnivores, it would be well to keep one's eye on this area of the colon, for differences in it, and also the stomach, constitute two of the major points of variation between carnivorous and herbivorous design.

The length of the colon, like that of the small intestine, is subject to considerable variation, according to different authorities. In a large dog it is generally considered to be about

four feet. The colon terminates in the globular rectum, which is the area where fecal material is stored until enough has accumulated to make expelling it worthwhile. The opening of the rectum to the outside is called the *anus*. The volume of the rectum is about that of a baseball.

Since digestion of food is complete by the time the small intestinal contents are emptied into the colon, the latter organ has no digestive function. The indigestible residue of the carnivorous diet is small; therefore the colon of these animals is short, of small capacity, and with a physiological activity confined to the transport of indigestible waste to the outside and reabsorption of water and a few minerals from it.

The contents of the small intestine are emptied into the colon as a water suspension. As this material is slowly moved along the colon the water is absorbed; its consistency becomes more firm and its volume smaller. By the time it reaches the rectum this waste material has become a small firm mass, possibly about the size of an egg or tennis ball. When expelled, this material constitutes the bowel movement. When on a normal diet of meat and fat, the dog's stool is firm and practically odorless. Evacuation of the rectum occurs once in each twenty-four to forty-eight hours.

In the carnivore the colon is by no means a vital organ; carnivorous animals get along well (albeit with less convenience) after the entire large bowel has been removed.

The healthy carnivorous digestive tract furnishes residence for relatively few bacteria and no microprotozoa. These are microscopic-sized organisms; the former are plant material, while the latter are animalcules. The strong acid of the stomach guarantees that most microorganisms swallowed with the food or otherwise will be killed, or at least be attenuated and not allowed to multiply in that area. Those escaping the stomach are rarely able to withstand the digestive activity of the small intestine. However, toward the lower end of the small intestine, where digestive activity has almost disappeared, a few surviving bacteria are to be found. But in the large intestine, myriad organisms thrive and serve some function in forming certain vitamins: pyridoxine, biotin, folic acid, Vitamin K, and possibly others. The bac-

teria of the carnivorous colon are of the putrefactive type; they flourish in an alkaline medium. The digestive tract we have been considering is practically sterile (devoid of organisms) except in the large intestine.

The coefficient of digestion is the percentage of ingested food that is digested, absorbed, and utilized by the animal. It is a measure of nutritive efficiency and, in the carnivore eating its normal diet of meat and fat, the coefficient approaches 100%.

This, then, is the carnivorous digestive tract. It is simple, short, and of small capacity. A small variety of concentrated food is ingested at infrequent intervals. Food is digested only by enzymes which are manufactured by the animal itself. The meat-eating animals have no dependence upon microorganisms to assist in digesting the food. The food is almost completely digested and absorbed, leaving but little excretory bulk. Digestion is rapid, complete, and intermittent. The entire alimentary canal functions for a few hours, then enters upon an interdigestive period of rest. Significant digestive activity is confined to the small intestine. The carnivore is able to maintain life even after losing both stomach and colon, but cannot survive a loss of the small intestine.

Chapter 5

A SHEEP

The herbivorous animal selected for comparison with an adult human is a ruminant, the sheep. The digestive tube of this animal, as well as other herbivores, is unbelievably complicated. [36] [49] It is proportionately over four times as long as that of the carnivorous animal, being about twenty-five times the animal's body length.

Whereas the abdominal organs of all carnivores are remarkably similar in design, those of herbivores vary widely, being of two types: 1) those with simple stomachs, such as the horse, ass, rabbit, and 2) those with complex stomachs: the ox, goat, sheep, camel, etc. The latter are called ruminants because they "ruminant" or chew a cud as a part of the digestive process. The stomach of these animals is complex, possessing four separate chambers. In addition they have a large functioning *cecum*. Herbivores with simple stomachs possess relatively larger cecal pouches to accomplish the difficult chore of digesting plant material. The fact that ruminants can subsist on brush and scrub, while simple-stomached herbivores require grass and succulent plant foods, suggests the digestive apparatus of the former to be the more efficient.

The sheep has no canine teeth or incisors in the upper jaw. It has flat molar teeth and the jaw movements are rotary, designed for grinding rather than tearing or crushing.

The herbivorous salivary glands contribute saliva of greater significance, since it is intimately dispersed throughout the food during rumination.

While mastication is unimportant in the dog, it is of vital importance in the sheep. While grazing, the fodder is not chewed, but is swallowed immediately into the first chamber of the stomach. After this chamber has been filled and opportunity presents itself to the animal, a process of regurgitation begins which returns small parcels, or cuds, to the mouth for rechewing and further mixing with saliva. Since the saliva of the sheep contains no amylase (starch-splitting enzyme), this process of chewing the cud must be merely for the purpose of aerating, macerating, and mixing the cellulose for more efficient and complete digestion by the stomach.

While the sheep's esophagus, like that of the carnivore, is a simple tube-like structure, from this point all semblance of simplicity in the herbivorous digestive design ceases to exist. Instead of the small, simple stomach of the carnivore, the sheep has a cluster of four chambers to accomplish the gastric preparation of its food for digestion by the intestine. The first of these is called the *rumen*. This is a storage chamber which also allows digestion to occur within it. The rumen does not secrete any digestive juices into its lumen but does contain countless billions of microorganisms, both bacteria and protozoa. These organisms set to work breaking down and predigesting the fodder before it is presented to certain subsequent areas of the digestive tract for true enzymatic digestion.

The most important change occurring in the rumen is the breakdown of cellulose to *cellobiose*, a process accomplished solely by the action of the microorganisms. This sort of digestive activity is entirely missing from the carnivorous alimentary tract and, as re-emphasized, constitutes one of the basic differences between herbivores and carnivores.

Other carbohydrates are changed to volatile fatty acids, and still others are absorbed by the bacteria and protozoa and reconstructed within their bodies into entirely different substances.

The rumen is capable of absorbing many of the products

of cellulose degradation direction into the blood stream for use by the body. While only 50% of the total cellulose ingested is used by the herbivorous animal, about 70% of that which is used is digested and absorbed by the rumen. Smaller amounts of cellulose may pass through the digestive tract to the cecum and colon, where bacteria again have an opportunity to digest it. No cellulose digestion occurs in other chambers of the stomach or in the small intestine. The rumen is never empty, even after prolonged periods of starvation. The residue therein serves to reinoculate fresh food with the bacteria and protozoa necessary to carry on this vital phase of the digestive process in the herbivore.

The diet of the herbivore is bulky, as attested to by the large capacity of this first of the four chambers of the sheep stomach, which is about five gallons. Hunters have removed as much as 380 pounds of leaves and twigs from the rumen of a 1,900-pound African buffalo, and nearly a half-ton of fodder from a seven-ton elephant. [13]

Digestion of proteins in the rumen is but poorly understood. Since there are no enzymes secreted by the rumen, digestion of these protein substances is presumably also accomplished by the microorganisms. It has been recently pointed out that at least some ruminants, such as the camel, when in a state of protein deficiency, can secrete urea (a waste product containing nitrogen which is normally lost in the urine) into the rumen, where it can be used in making new protein molecules. Much of the nitrogen-containing material found in the rumen is thought to be incorporated into the protoplasm of the bacteria and microprotozoa, the latter of which, it is to be remembered, are tiny animals. When these are subsequently digested in the intestine, they liberate their own body protein for use by the host animal.

This, it is believed, is the ingenious mechanism that transforms plant protein into animal protein within the herbivorous digestive tract, making it possible for herbivores to survive without even traces of animal protein in their diet.

Nobel prize winner Artturi Virtanen [91-23] [96-8] [98-10] has shown that test cows, ruminants structurally and functionally identical with the sheep, are able to grow normally, produce milk with normal protein content, and drop

normal calves, even though their diet contained no protein of any sort, either animal or vegetable. The cows accomplish this biochemical miracle because the microbes of the rumen are able to manufacture animal proteins from nonprotein compounds of nitrogen, such as ammonia and urea, possibly from the nitrogen in the air itself.

The prodigious numbers of these tiny animals, and the fact that they are never excreted in the feces, makes such a theory tenable. Since they are born, live, and die within the herbivorous digestive tract, theirs is indeed a monotonous life. About the only activity allowed them is that of procreation, which they accomplish with astounding rapidity.

It is somewhat humiliating to learn that very probably most carnivorous nutrition, including that of us humans, depends for its very existence upon these lowly bacteria and protozoa—the vital link in the propagation and growth of our herbivorous food animals.

Another interesting observation concerning microbial function in digestion by the herbivore is seen in the simple-stomached, vegetarian mountain gorilla. [42] In the free state this animal has many protozoa residing within its stomach, which doubtless play a vital role in the digestion of plant substances and the synthesis of animal proteins. In captivity these protozoa gradually disappear from the gorilla's stomach. Then, being unable to synthesize his own animal protein, the animal must be fed meat, milk, or other animal proteins if he is to remain healthy.

While the rumen probably does not by itself digest plant proteins, it is here that the cellulose envelope is stripped from the plant cell, exposing its nutriments (starch, vegetable proteins, and fats) to digestion by the true enzymes farther along the digestive tract.

The second compartment of the herbivorous stomach is called the *reticulum*. It is much smaller than the rumen, having a capacity of only two quarts. Its function is not known with certainty. Apparently it is here that small portions of the ruminal contents are received and compressed into the small wads (cuds), by absorption of water and some of the earlier products of digestion. These are periodically regurgitated for rechewing and reinsalivation, after which

they are swallowed to the rumen for additional bacterial decomposition, although a portion is thought to be returned to the reticulum. It should be noted that this process of rumination, or cud-chewing, while of vital importance to the sheep's nutrition, has no counterpart in any carnivorous animal.

Contents from both the rumen and reticulum pass, at the proper time, into the third chamber, the *omasum*. This chamber holds about a gallon of material. The function of this third chamber is also uncertain. None of the three compartments of the stomach named thus far contribute acid or any known digestive juice to the aliment. Their combined function is merely to prepare, by the action of microorganisms, ingested food for true or enzymatic digestion, by the fourth, or true stomach, which is called the *abomasum*.

The sheep's abomasum has a capacity of about two gallons. It differs from the first three chambers of the ruminant stomach already described, for it possesses secreting glands within its walls which contribute hydrochloric acid, pepsin, and a weak, fat-splitting enzyme (lipase) to its contents. All of these digestive juices are present in much less concentration than in the dog. They dissolve plant proteins and fats which have been freed of their cellulose investments. Of more vital importance is their action in killing and dissolving the billions of bacteria and microprotozoa arriving from the omasum. Seeds, cereal grains, bits of plant material, and cellulose which have escaped dissolution in the first three chambers, pass through the abomasum unchanged. They are emptied into the small intestine along with liquefied proteins, fats, starches, traces of sugar, and living and dead organisms.

The remarkable ability of the ruminant stomach to channel foodstuffs in and out of its various chambers is poorly understood by veterinary physiologists.

If we compare the gastric phase of digestion in the carnivore with that of the sheep, it may be seen that the dog swallows food directly into its glandular stomach, which is equivalent to the herbivorous abomasum, simply because it does not have a rumen, reticulum, or omasum. The four-chambered stomach is unnecessary for flesh-eating animals,

whose food is ready for enzymatic digestion immediately upon being swallowed.

The total volume of the sheep's stomach may be summarized as follows: [49]

<i>Chamber</i>	<i>Volume</i>
Rumen	20 quarts
Reticulum	2 quarts
Omasum	4 quarts
Abomasum	8 quarts
Total	34 quarts (8½ gallons)

While the herbivorous stomach is extremely complex and capacious as compared to that of the carnivore, it differs in still another important aspect: it functions continuously around the clock, having no period of interdigestive rest, as does the carnivorous. In the herbivore the stomach is a vital organ, the animal being unable to live without it.

The small intestine of the sheep is several times longer, proportionately, than is that of the dog. It has approximately the same structure and accessory glands of digestion, the pancreas, and the liver. As in the dog, the sheep pancreas secretes enzymes for the digestion of plant proteins, fat, and starch. A most important protein substance that is digested and absorbed by the small intestine is the mass of bacteria and microprotozoa from the rumen, previously described. Since the herbivore is a continuous feeder whose digestive tract never rests, there is a continuous need for bile in the intestine. Therefore, most herbivores have no gallbladder for storage of bile or, if one is present, it has little or no ability to concentrate the bile or to expel it by contracting.

The small intestine of the herbivore empties into the large intestine or colon. While the carnivore has at this point merely a small blind pouch with no function at all, the cecum in the sheep is much longer and larger. It has an active function to perform, that of further digesting seeds, cereal grains, bits of plant material, and cellulose which reach it from the small intestine. Similar digestive activity takes place in the colon itself.

Since it possesses digestive as well as absorptive and excretory functions, the herbivorous colon may also be expected to be quite complex. The colon itself is long and capacious. Digestion in both the cecum and colon is accomplished by bacteria for the most part, although pancreatic enzymes which have reached the colon and are still active assist to some degree. The microprotozoa of the herbivorous stomach are rarely, if ever, encountered in the colon or cecum. The power of the cecum and colon to digest cellulose is dramatically demonstrated by the complete dissolution of cotton threads placed therein. [49]

Final digestion and absorption of the cellulose that is utilized by the animal takes place in the cecum (17%), and in the colon (13%). It should be recalled, however, that digestion of cellulose by the herbivore is a most inefficient process, at best allowing no more than half of the ingested cellulose material to be ultimately utilized by the animal. In addition to the inefficient utilization of cellulose, further waste occurs because stripping of the cellulose investment from protein, fat, and carbohydrate-rich grains is incomplete in the rumen, thus defeating all efforts of the pancreatic juice to digest many of them.

While the coefficient of digestion is almost 100% in carnivores, it is only 50% in herbivores. It is indeed fortunate that this dietetically wasteful animal has an unlimited source of food.

Excretion of such a large percentage of the voluminous diet as waste by these herbivores necessarily requires the frequent evacuation of copious feces, in which undigested plant material and grain can be readily recognized.

The length of time required for herbivorous digestion is much longer than that of carnivores. It has been stated that the rumen of the ox, for instance, never empties. Any particular bit of fodder may remain in the rumen for one to three days before being passed to the next compartment of the stomach. The stomach of the horse requires twenty-four hours without food before it becomes empty.

Summarizing the herbivorous digestive function, the anatomical structure and biochemical, microbiological, and physiological activities going on therein are extremely com-

plex. They are, in fact, so poorly understood by students of veterinary science that many of the precise mechanisms of digestion remain a mystery.

The herbivorous animal ingests great quantities of food of low nutritional value, then proceeds to waste at least half of it, with a resulting low coefficient of digestion. Food is slowly digested at both ends as well as in the middle of the digestive tract. This activity is continuous because such a great quantity of material must be processed. Unlike the carnivore, herbivorous digestion is vitally dependent upon microbial activity. The bacterial organisms digest cellulose and "predigest" other food. Without this processing, the digestive enzymes of the intestine would be almost powerless to function. The protozoal organisms are thought to synthesize animal protein from plant food.

The herbivore is a continuous feeder, and its digestive apparatus functions continuously around the clock. Much of the ingested food is not digested or utilized by the animal, causing the feces to be voluminous and to contain much undigested material. The stomach, small intestine, cecum, and colon are all vital organs to the herbivore, since it cannot live without any one of them.

Chapter 6

AND A MAN

To describe the structure and function of a human digestive tract would be merely repetitious, for it is practically identical with that of the dog already delineated. The sole difference between the two is the presence in man of a rudimentary structure springing from a functionless cecum; this is called the appendix. This organ has long been considered to be a degenerated structure and is often cited as evidence that man was originally herbivorous and then became carnivorous. Supposedly, as this dietary change occurred, he gradually lost the use of his cecum, since he was no longer digesting vegetable material, and it gradually shriveled into the vestige we know today. Others, however, suggest that man might not be losing his appendix at all, but is attempting to gain a functioning cecum. This would suggest that he was an original carnivore and that centuries of increasing plant food consumption caused this adaptive change in his digestive tract, in an effort to afford greater digestive capability for his civilized diet.

Since this is a purely philosophical matter which will not be solved in less than another ten thousand years, it is pointless to pursue it further.

To summarize the structure and function of man's digestive tract, it is seen to be short, being only about five times the length of his body. Man, like the dog, has incisor teeth in

both upper and lower jaws. The canine teeth are less well-developed, but they are present. The jaw movements are up and down, which, with the ridged molars, suggests a tearing and crushing rather than a chewing function. When eating a diet of meat, fat, and only a little carbohydrate, mastication is of little or no importance to the human.

Man's stomach is of a simple structure and small, having a capacity of two quarts or less. It secretes a strong acid which effectively dissolves all meat and fat before they leave the stomach. Plant substances are poorly dissolved. Man's stomach functions intermittently, emptying a full meal in about three hours, then resting until he again eats. The human stomach is not a vital organ, as proved by hundreds of individuals who have lost all or most of it through surgery, yet manage to maintain normal nutrition.

The human small intestine is also short. It is the only organ that digests food and absorbs the products of digestion to a significant degree. It is therefore a vital organ. On a diet of meat and fat with only modest amounts of processed carbohydrate, the small intestine of man is capable of digesting and absorbing practically all of the aliment, leaving but a small residue to be excreted by the colon. The accessory glands of digestion are well-developed. Enzymes manufactured by the pancreas, and to a minor degree the small intestine, constitute the only mechanism by which food is digested in the human body. The gallbladder is well developed and functions strongly. It evacuates only when fat is present in the intestine.

The human colon has no digestive function. Its chief activity is excretory, carrying indigestible residue from the small intestine to the outside. By absorbing water from it, the colon forms the waste material into a small, compact mass. The cecum in man is functionless. The colon is not a vital organ and may be removed with no loss except convenience. The rectum is small, and on a proper diet should evacuate once each twenty-four to forty-eight hours. The stool should be firm and practically odorless.

Similar to the dog, digestion and absorption of foodstuffs do not occur at either end of man's alimentary canal but only in the middle part, the small intestine.

The human is not in the least dependent upon micro-organisms as an aid to digestion. Man digests and absorbs his food normally even though the entire digestive tract has been sterilized with antibiotics. Except for the colon, there are but few bacteria and no protozoa within the human alimentary canal.

Man is an intermittent feeder, although he usually eats more frequently than is good for him. Man never ruminates or chews his cud. Man cannot digest cellulose or unprocessed plant materials. Man cannot survive with no animal protein in his diet.

The foregoing data, comparing digestive tract structure and function in the dog, sheep, and man, will be found in Table I. After perusal of these facts, it appears certain that man is constructed as a carnivore, he functions as a carnivore, and therefore, by inference, he should eat as a carnivore. His diet should be protein—mostly from animal sources—fat, and little or no carbohydrate. Even in small amounts, the latter substance as well as vegetable proteins should not be consumed unless they have been processed to allow their digestion and absorption.

TABLE I

FUNCTIONAL AND STRUCTURAL COMPARISON OF MAN'S DIGESTIVE TRACT
WITH THAT OF THE DOG AND SHEEP

	MAN	DOG	SHEEP
TEETH			
incisors	both jaws	both jaws	lower jaw only
molars	ridged	ridged	flat
canines	small	large	absent
JAW			
movements	vertical	vertical	rotary
function	tearing-crushing	tearing-crushing	grinding
mastication	unimportant	unimportant	vital function
rumination	never	never	vital function
STOMACH			
capacity	2 quarts	2 quarts	8½ gallons
emptying time	3 hours	3 hours	never empties
interdigestive rest	yes	yes	no
bacteria present	no	no	yes—vital
protozoa present	no	no	yes—vital
gastric acidity	strong	strong	weak
cellulose digestion	none	none	70%—vital
digestive activity	weak	weak	vital function
food absorbed from	no	no	vital function
COLON AND CECUM			
size of colon	short—small	short—small	long—capacious
size of cecum	tiny	tiny	long—capacious
function of cecum	none	none	vital function
appendix	vestigial	absent	cecum
rectum	small	small	capacious
digestive activity	none	none	vital function
cellulose digestion	none	none	30%—vital
bacterial flora	putrefactive	putrefactive	fermentative
food absorbed from	none	none	vital function
volume of feces	small—firm	small—firm	voluminous
gross food in feces	rare	rare	large amount

	MAN	DOG	SHEEP
GALLBLADDER size function	well-developed strong	well-developed strong	often absent weak or absent
DIGESTIVE ACTIVITY from pancreas from bacteria from protozoa digestive efficiency	solely none none 100%	solely none none 100%	partial partial partial 50% or less
FEEDING HABITS frequency	intermittent	intermittent	continuous
SURVIVAL WITHOUT stomach colon and cecum microorganisms plant foods animal protein	possible possible possible possible impossible	possible possible possible possible impossible	impossible impossible impossible impossible possible
RATIO OF BODY LENGTH TO entire digestive tract small intestine	1:5 1:4	1:7 1:6	1:27 1:25

Chapter 7

HOW FOOD BECOMES YOU

Digestion and absorption of foods, by an animal, is to furnish certain substances for the nourishment and repair of its body. Food substances are of three sorts—proteins, fats and carbohydrates. Everything that is not protein or fat is carbohydrate. As previously mentioned, meat, fat, and carbohydrate cannot be absorbed as such; they must first be broken down into their simplest component molecules. This is the process of digestion we have been talking about for the last three chapters. In the human it occurs as follows. [33]

Proteins are of two types: animal protein and vegetable protein. The former makes up the meat, fish, cheese, and egg of the animal kingdom, while plant proteins are found in legumes, nuts, and cereal grains. All proteins contain nitrogen and are made up of a number of chemical substances called amino acids. There are at least twenty different amino acids. They occur in various combinations in different protein molecules; a particular protein is characterized by a specific combination of various amino acids. Most vegetable proteins do not contain all twenty of the amino acids; practically all animal proteins do.

All proteins are digested by trypsin, an enzyme in the pancreatic juice, and split up into their constituent amino acids, which are then readily absorbed by the intestine.

Animal protein is digested directly, but plant proteins must be processed to remove the enveloping cellulose before the trypsin can get to them and become effective. This processing must take place outside the human body, but the herbivore can accomplish the processing within its own digestive tract, as described in Chapter 5.

Fats are also both animal and vegetable in origin. The molecular structure of fat may be shown as follows:

G—FATTY ACID
L
Y
C—FATTY ACID
E
R
O
L—FATTY ACID

Any fat consists of a molecule of glycerol, to which are joined three fatty acid molecules. Fats of animal origin contain for the most part only "saturated" fatty acids, while plant fats are made with more of the "unsaturated" varieties. It is the character, length, and degree of "saturation" of the various fatty acids composing fat that determine its character, whether butter, suet, lard, etc., from the animal kingdom; or olive oil, corn oil, or safflower oil, etc., of vegetable origin. As a rule animal fats are solid at room temperature, while vegetable fats are liquid.

Fats are digested into one molecule of glycerol and three of fatty acid by lipase, another enzyme in the pancreatic juice. In this form they are readily absorbed by the digestive tract.

Carbohydrate, except for small amounts of glycogen found in animal tissues, is exclusively of plant origin. The carbohydrate molecule varies in size and complexity from woody substances, such as cellulose, to simple starches and sugars. The only carbohydrates susceptible to digestion by the enzymes of human pancreatic and intestinal juices are starches and sugars, which must be broken down to the sim-

plest of sugars—glucose—before they can be absorbed. Not even natural starches or sugars, such as potato starch or cane sugar, can be absorbed until they have been reduced to glucose.

Since all glucose molecules are identical, regardless of the form of carbohydrate from which they were derived, it seems rather inane that some dietitians insist that dietary carbohydrates must come from varied sources in order for a diet to be "balanced."

Absorption of the products of digestion varies with the food substance. Glycerol and fatty acids from fat digestion are absorbed directly by the intestinal veins and lymphatic channels, thus reaching the general circulation immediately.

Amino acids and glucose, resulting from protein and carbohydrate digestion respectively, follow a different route. They are collected by the veins draining the intestines and channeled through the liver before reaching the general circulation.

There is a good reason for this. There are many toxic substances, including incompletely digested protein and carbohydrate, which may be absorbed from the intestine and damage certain tissues of the body, were they to appear in the general circulation. The heart, lungs, kidneys, and especially the brain and central nervous system must be protected from these substances. Therefore, with the exception of fat, all substances absorbed from the digestive tract are made to pass through the liver, where they are detoxified and rendered innocuous. Were it not for this protective mechanism, the body would often be threatened by absorption of poisonous substances being generated within, or finding their way into the digestive tube.

Metabolism is a term describing what happens to amino acids, fatty acids, glycerol, and glucose after they have been absorbed from the digestive tract, including how they nourish and repair the tissues of the body. No animal, not even man, consumes a perfectly "balanced" diet; that is, one that furnishes exactly the proper amounts of amino acids, fatty acids, glycerol, and glucose for the animal's needs. It is

inevitable that some of these substances will be in short supply, while others are present in excess. It is therefore necessary, in order to avoid wasting nutritive material, that the animal be able to change those that are superfluous into those which are missing. Much of this metabolic activity takes place in the liver, another reason why absorbed foods are channeled first through that organ.

Fats and carbohydrates contain but three atoms in their makeup—carbon, oxygen, and hydrogen. Proteins contain nitrogen, and occasionally sulfur and iodine, in addition. Whereas fats can be formed from glucose and glucose may be formed from fat, and either or both may be synthesized from certain amino acids, proteins can never be made from either fat or glucose, since those substances lack the nitrogen necessary to form the protein molecule.

Animal proteins yield at least twenty different amino acids when digested. Some of these, if present in excess, can be altered by the metabolic processes of the liver to fit a protein molecule being synthesized by the animal to repair a worn-out cell somewhere. This is a process comparable to a stonemason who might alter the size or shape of certain stones to make them fit properly into a wall he is building.

There are, however, about ten of the amino acids that are *essential*. These are amino acids that cannot be synthesized or tailored from others by the metabolic powers of the liver. The carnivorous animal and human must obtain these essential amino acids from animal proteins, for plant proteins are deficient in one or more of them. If even one of the essential amino acids is missing consistently from the diet of man, proper nutrition will be impossible. He will be unhealthy and will eventually succumb. This will happen in spite of the total intake of plant proteins, fats, carbohydrates or total calories. (See *kwashiorkor*, Chapter 18.)

If a man eats a roast beef sandwich, his liver is presented with a full spectrum of amino acids, including all ten of the essential ones. If he eats a peanut butter sandwich he will not receive one or more of these vital amino acids.

Herbivores, however, are much more fortunately situated, since they receive metabolic support from the protozoa within their digestive tracts, which can accomplish the

synthesis of essential amino acids and animal protein from plant protein. This is the reason that men, and other carnivores, are dependent upon a dietary intake of animal protein for survival, while the herbivores are not.

The metabolism of fats is rather simple. The fatty acids are used for energy by the skeletal muscles as well as other tissues of the body, including the heart. In combination with phosphorous, the fats become important components of the central nervous system, and in other forms are essential to the synthesis of many hormones. It is impossible for any carnivore to maintain life on a completely fat-free diet. Fatty acids and glycerol, if present over the energy requirements of the body, may be reintroduced to each other in the liver and resynthesized to fat, which is deposited in the fat depots, where it remains until a period of caloric deficiency summons it to be used in maintaining the body's energy requirements. Certain of the fatty acids and the glycerol of fat may be converted to glucose by the liver when necessary. About 10% of all fat eaten, or cannibalized from its own fat stores during starvation, is thus available to the carnivorous animal as glucose.

Carbohydrate metabolism is of vital importance in any animal, for without glucose the red cells of the blood and the central nervous system cease functioning and death ensues. These are the only tissues of the body that are absolutely glucose-dependent; that is, that cease to function if deprived of a steady supply of this substance. In addition to dietary carbohydrate, glucose may be obtained from fat, as mentioned, but an even more important source of glucose is the amino acids.

Certain of the amino acids so nearly resemble part of the glucose molecule that they may undergo conversion in the liver by a process of sorting, dividing, joining, separating, or minor chemical alterations to form glucose. In this way about 35% to 50% of protein may become available to the body as glucose.

It is now apparent that man requires three essential substances from his diet: protein for the repair of worn-out tissues, fatty acids for muscular energy, and glucose for nourishment of the red blood cell mass and the central ner-

vous system. Other materials also necessary for the utilization of food substances are water, oxygen, vitamins, and minerals. Except for oxygen, these substances are furnished by way of the digestive tract, or are synthesized by the body itself.

The carnivorous animal and man can, of course, secure adequate amino acids for tissue repair, and fatty acids for energy, from a diet of meat and fat. Glucose necessary for the central nervous system and blood is easily secured from fat and protein by the mechanisms described above. Therefore, a diet of animal protein and fat alone is a complete source of nutrition for these animals and man. This explains why the tiger in his cage, as well as all free-living carnivores, thrive on such a simple diet. It also explains why man, such as the Eskimo, can live his entire life with no food except his beloved fat and animal proteins; [28] [41] why his malamute can strain from dawn to dusk in the sled harness with no food but a chunk of oily salmon each day.

It explains also why man can stay on a total fast (except for water) for as long as 249 days and maintain not only life but strength for at least moderate activity. [76-7]

For those who might find these last statements difficult to believe, let me explain how the body accomplishes it.

A fasting man must have 112 grams of glucose per day to nourish his nervous system and red blood cell mass. This is an absolute *must*. In addition he needs fatty acids for muscular energy and to keep the heart beating. Finally, he requires amino acids for tissue repair. Since none of these are being taken into the body, he must obtain them from his own tissues. He is able to get abundant fatty acids from the fat in his storage depots. This gives him ample muscular energy. In addition, the breakdown of glycerol and fatty acids to form glucose will liberate 10% of its substance as glucose—about fifty grams for each pound of fat he loses. The rest of the glucose he is obliged to furnish his body each day must come from the sole remaining source—amino acids. Thus he is forced to metabolize his own muscle and connective tissue to furnish this life-saving glucose. He does this by shifting protein substances from non-vital organs to vital structures as the proteins of the latter areas wear out. Thus

amino acids from connective tissues, muscles, and the inactive digestive tract, are sacrificed to form glucose and to repair the vital organs such as the heart, blood vessels, glandular tissues and the central nervous system.

Now, if protein in a small amount—two to three ounces daily—is fed, the minimal protein needs for repair and glucose synthesis are satisfied. The subject ceases to use his own protein and continues to secure fatty acids and some glucose from his fat stores. [62-2] Thus, so long as man has an excess of fat on his body and receives a few ounces of high-grade animal protein each day, he remains in adequate nutritional balance. When all the non-essential fat of the body has been used, he then must begin to ingest an amount of fat equal to that he has been losing each day and he must continue to ingest a minimal amount of protein. If he wishes to gain weight by restocking his fat stores, he may do this by adding carbohydrate to his diet or increasing his protein and fat intake.

Lack of food does not affect stamina or resistance to cold until the terminal stages of starvation. [75-1] [91-14] [91-20]

This remarkable metabolic mechanism of carnivorous animals and man shows how he can be dietetically profligate when food is abundant, yet is able to keep in metabolic balance with no more food than a modest amount of meat and fat when the going gets rough.

It explains why the low carbohydrate diet is most effective in weight reduction and why the human can continue to work, play, think clearly, fight, and make love, even though he has been hungry for a week. Were man not possessed of this mechanism, and if he got weak when he became hungry, he would indeed be a fragile specimen, absolutely dependent upon a continuous food supply and totally inadequate to survive even the first generation, let alone a million or more years.

With these facts in mind, as we next begin to examine man's diet for the past million years, it may be conjectured that when he *did* venture to diversify his food intake it was not because of malnutrition—but because he was hungry.

Chapter 8

MAN EXPERIMENTS WITH HIS DIET, BUT TIMIDLY (A Trifling Ecological Readjustment)

Sometime during the Miocene Period, from two to thirty million years ago, a common ancestor of all primates appeared. This fellow is now called *Proconsul*, and from him descended, in a straight line, man in his present form, *Homo sapiens*. Man, the only surviving descendant of *Proconsul*, differed from his cousins, the anthropoid apes, in that he forsook the trees for a terrestrial abode and learned to walk erect, with specialized locomotion in the lower extremities and constructive grasping in the upper. The latter skill eventually developed into the use of tools.

As nearly as can be determined primitive man first emerged about two million years ago, during the early Pleistocene (the glacial epoch) Age. Evidence is abundant that for many thousands of years primitive man subsisted on purely carnivorous fare. (See Table II for the Ages of Man and their approximate durations.)

His first departure from this uniform diet was of minor degree, consisting merely of the experimental ingestion of certain plant substances. It is highly probable that this departure in food habit was from necessity and not from choice.

Ancient man left no written record of what he put into his stomach, but we can reconstruct from secondary evidence

his diet during various phases of cultural evolution. Such evidence is gained chiefly from the study of artifacts excavated from his prehistoric villages and homesites. To be useful in this respect, the "tools" of prehistoric man must be dated so that a given implement obviously used in farming, for example, could be identified as preceding or following another used for hunting.

Once the function of an artifact has been established and its relative antiquity determined, much may be learned about the way of life of each succeeding anthropologic era; we can trace with considerable accuracy how man acquired his food and what it was at various periods during his long march from Proconsul to civilized existence.

Several systems are used for dating a certain tool or other relic. First, its being found in association with a given geologic era will suggest whether it was made during the earliest period conceivable by man, or during more recent times. Also, the type of workmanship and the relative sophistication of a given tool will serve to refer it to known cultures.

Another method of dating can be utilized if the artifact is found in proximity to the remains of extinct plant or animal life. While this does not afford a definitive dating, it does serve to establish the tool as being older than another not associated with the same form of life.

Microexamination of pollen grains [23] or even the examination of mummified or fossilized fecal material left behind by Paleolithic (Old Stone) Age humans gives valuable clues to when the material came into existence, and what man was placing in his digestive tract at that time. [96-12] The study of primitive cave art has furnished a pictorial story of Paleolithic man, the weapons he used, the animals he slew, and the plants he gathered, which his descendants later cultivated. [16]

Until quite recently the most reliable method of dating ancient remains, and thereby the civilizations producing them, was by the meticulous excavation of succeeding layers of an ancient urban site. The most superficial layer of an excavation was, of course, the most modern, while each deeper stratum revealed the tools and other vestiges of an earlier

culture and told much of their customs.

Since all of these succeeding layers were laid down during the Paleolithic (Old Stone) Age, it became customary to divide the Paleolithic into upper, middle and lower epochs, depending upon which stratum (upper, middle, or lower) was being studied or was the source of artifacts.

Possibly the ultimate in precision dating of archaeologic finds was achieved by the atomic age scientist Dr. W. F. Libby. [52] All living matter contains carbon, and each living plant or animal continues to acquire carbon molecules from its environment until its death. A minute portion of the carbon thus acquired is Carbon-14. Carbon-14 is regular carbon which has been exposed to atmospheric radiation by cosmic rays, and has become radioactive. After ingestion by a living organism the Carbon-14, unlike regular carbon, begins to emit particles of itself; in effect, it begins to decay. If the amount of this decay that has occurred within the organism after its death is measured by means of a Geiger counter, the length of time it has been decaying (its age) can be calculated. The accuracy of this method is within 150 years.

Similar techniques, using isotopes of potassium-argon and fluorine, have been developed for dating substances such as soil, rocks, etc., which contain no carbon. [106-5]

There is speculation and some controversy about when man first appeared on earth. Most authorities have used the convenient figure of a million years to date his debut, but recently this has been set backward about five million years. [85-4]

Possibly some confusion rises from different concepts of man: whether he is represented by all forms of humanoid subsequent to the archetype Proconsul, or if the designation should be reserved to fully evolved man, *homo sapiens*. It is believed that the first apes to descend from the trees (possibly as long ago as thirty million years) were less than five feet tall and weighed less than ninety pounds. [106-5] They had a brain capacity of considerably less than seven hundred cubic centimeters, and are called *protohominids*. These were the creatures representing the human race during the Miocene Period, which extended from thirty million to two million years ago.

Toward the end of the Miocene and the beginning of the Paleolithic Age, these protohominids had evolved to an upright carriage and had increased the cranial capacity to about nine hundred cubic centimeters. These types are called *homo erectus*, and are generally considered to be the first examples to warrant the prefix *homo* (man).

In 1959, English anthropologist Dr. Louis S. B. Leaky [88-2] unearthed a most primitive skull from the soil of the Olduvai Gorge, in East Africa. [40] [106-3] He named his find *Zinjanthropus* (East Africa man), and estimated his primitive hominid to have existed at least one and one-half to two million years ago. This estimate was confirmed by potassium-argon dating at the University of California. *Zinjanthropus* is the earliest known specimen of *homo erectus*.

The findings of Leaky thus rolled back the curtain of antiquity a full million years earlier than the point previously glimpsed when the remains of Java Man and his contemporary, Peking Man, were discovered and dated as having lived about 400,000 years ago. More recently, anthropologist Wu Ju-Kang estimates Lantien Man, unearthed in Lantien County of Northwest Central China, to have lived between 400,000 and 600,000 years in the past. [107-1]

Specimens of still more recent human skulls dating from 100,000 years ago show but little difference, either in size or shape, from those of modern man. These are represented by Cro-Magnon and Neanderthal Man, and, because their brain size is equal to that of our human contemporaries (about 1,500 cubic centimeters), are called *homo sapiens*, true intelligent, sensible, reasoning men. [74-29]

Another source of confusion in dating man's progress might arise from the fact that various degrees of culture were not achieved simultaneously in all areas of the world. Thus it is well-known that a complicated and polished civilization had flourished and died in the fertile crescent of Mesopotamia before farming had even begun in England, and that a virtual Old Stone Age culture persisted among the Indians of America long after its discovery by Columbus or colonization by the British. In fact, a number of true

Stone Age cultures still are to be found today in certain remote areas of the earth. (See Chapter 12.)

For purposes of orientation for this and subsequent chapters, Table II has been prepared. It should be noted that the dates are far from exact—a difference of opinion amounting to one or a hundred centuries being often considered inconsequential among anthropologists.

Now that man, our subject of investigation, has been properly defined and oriented chronologically, it is permissible to search through the anthropological and archaeological evidence in an attempt to determine details of his diet during the long march from *Proconsul* to civilized existence.

What went on during the Miocene Age is so completely veiled by the mist and darkness of antiquity that there is no unanimity of opinion as to what constituted the diet of man during those thirty million years.

Proconsul was possibly vegetarian. *Proconsul* himself became extinct, but his two surviving lines of descendants eventually became *Hominid* (man) and *Anthropoid* (ape). Man chose to become a carnivore, while the anthropoids continued as plant eaters, for the most part. Why these two "cousins" chose different dietary habits is not clear. It has been suggested that man, since he conceived and made tools, used these to add meat to his diet. However, all other carnivores obtain meat for their diet quite satisfactorily without the use of tools. Also, this attitude would require that man had already perfected tools at the time of his schism from the anthropoids; this, as is known, is not true.

The explanation of most anthropologists [106-5] seems more acceptable. During the early Miocene Period (20-30 million years ago), a climatic change took place in Africa, the home of the great anthropoid apes. Heavy rains ceased and the jungle was replaced by grasslands. Not enough trees were left to support all the apes; the weaker were forced to live and feed on the ground. Food was scarce, and these creatures—the forerunners of man—were forced to eat small animals, snails, snakes, worms, and the food left over from the kills of predatory animals. The change to a meat diet carried advantages with it. Since it was more concentrated, less time was required to feed, leaving more leisure for hunt-

TABLE II

CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER OF MAN'S APPEARANCE AND EVOLUTION

(The Neolithic Age signaled the beginning of farming)

Geologic or Anthropologic Age	Began Years Ago	Ended Years Ago	Human Archetype	Lived Years Ago
Miocene	30,000,000	2,000,000	Proconsul Protohominid	
Paleolithic (Old Stone) Age	2,000,000		<i>Homo Erectus</i>	
Lower Paleolithic		100,000	<i>Zinjanthropus</i>	1,500,000
First Glaciation				2,000,000
Middle Paleolithic	100,000	50,000	<i>Australopithecus</i> Lantien Man Java Man Peking Man	1,000,000 500,000 500,000 360,000
Second Glaciation			<i>Homo Sapiens</i>	
Third Glaciation			Neanderthal Man	40,000
Upper Paleolithic	50,000	15,000	Cro-Magnon Man	30,000
Mesolithic (Middle Stone) Age				
Magdalenian Culture	15,000	9,000	Modern Man	
Neolithic (New Stone) Age	9,000	5,500		
Bronze Age	5,500	3,000		
Iron Age	3,000			
Atomic Age				

ing, tool-making, and the development of other manual skills.

Arctic explorer Vilhjalmur Stefansson also believes that man evolved from vegetarian anthropoid apes (*Proconsul?*), and gradually became carnivorous, while continuing to ingest some of the naturally occurring plant substances. This was a so-called "gathering stage," following which man gradually became purely carnivorous.

As noted in Table II, the Paleolithic and Pleistocene (Ice) Ages coincided. The latter Age consisted of at least three separate glaciations, between each two of which the climate returned to warm or even sub-tropical temperatures. The final retreat of the ice sheet was about fifteen thousand years ago. During the Pleistocene Age, many large animals (mammoth, mastodon, giant ground sloth, camel, horse, cave bear) were present in great profusion, guaranteeing man an abundant diet of his choice. It was during this era that man logically became a pure carnivore and, since this Ice Age lasted a million years, it can be reasonably stated that man remained a pure carnivore.

However, during the upper, or late Paleolithic Age, the great ice mass retreated for the last time; tundra was replaced by spreading forests. With this geologic change came the gradual disappearance of the great game herds. [52] Man again was forced to hunt small animals and birds, catch fish, or rely on insects, snakes and snails for his survival. Man's food supply was now uncertain, time-consuming to capture, and subject to marked seasonal variation. [23]

It was at this time—about fifteen thousand years ago—that man could have been reasonably expected to become increasingly dependent upon the gathering and storing of edible plant foods against the threat of famine and hunger.

While there exists no documentary evidence that this sequence of events actually did take place, the dating of man's tools now comes to play a vital role in support of this theory. Such evidence indicates that all of man's implements during the Ice Age were those used in the hunt (spear, spear thrower, bow and arrow, axes, all made of or tipped with stone points). The community wastes consisted of bones, cut or broken artificially for the marrow. No agricultural tools,

remains of cultivated grains, containers for storing or cooking plant materials, or other evidence of agriculture were found.

The Mesolithic Age is described as covering the various industries used by hunters between the last glaciation, about fifteen thousand years ago, and the beginning of agriculture between 9000 B.C. and 5400 B.C., the dates varying in different locations (Table II).

It is agreed by archaeologists that man reached his earliest cultural attainment in the area of the "fertile crescent," the Eastern Mediterranean. [52] In this region, the excavation of Belt Cave in the foothills of the Elburz Mountains of Iran, revealed at the eighth to the tenth levels no certain evidence of farming, but much to indicate an advanced animal husbandry. Here the bones of ox, pig, sheep, and goat were found in that order, indicating that the sheep and goat had been domesticated first, while the ox and pig were tamed somewhat later. Thus the immediate ancestors of the earliest Neolithic farmers were simple herdsmen and hunters until about 7000 B.C.

Evidence has been presented that a highly advanced Natufian hunter-fisher culture camped at the site of ancient Jericho in Jordan, [52] and at Jarmo [23] in northern Iraq, at about 7800 B.C. It has been stated that apparently these people supplemented their diet with grain, but there is no evidence that this was other than wild grain, and therefore was a form of "gathering" rather than true farming.

Exploration of a hunting village at Suberde, [98-14] Turkey (6500 B.C.), revealed no evidence of cultivated crops. The inhabitants subsisted on a plentiful animal life which included sheep, goats, pig, deer, ox, bear, and numerous other species of smaller wild game.

Excavation of caves in southern France revealed the skeletal remains of Neolithic peoples. Of greater importance were the vestiges of a much earlier Paleolithic society dug from the floor. These included the remains of many extinct animals which were charred, cut and artificially broken, showing that man (Cro-Magnon) not only lived at the same time as the extinct animals, but used them for food. [40] Bones of the cave bear, cave lion, cave hyena, mammoth,

woolly rhinoceros, wild pig, Irish elk, and bison were identified.

In England a most primitive settlement, called Starr Carr, was the home of an early Mesolithic hunter-fisher society living in the area of Yorkshire about 8000 B.C. Graham Clarke [52] describes the life of these people as wrestling daily with wild nature to get food. To what extent, if any, plant food was used is unknown, but evidence of meat consumption was definite: red deer, wild ox, elk, roe deer, wild pig, beaver, rodents, and birds. Fish bones were not found, probably because they were so perishable. The Starr Carr people made no further advance until the arrival of the Neolithic farmers about 2500 B.C. The dates mentioned have been confirmed by Carbon-14 dating.

Another primitive village in the British Isles was Skara Brae. [52] This Stone Age community flourished in the north of Britain simultaneously with the Bronze Age farther south. For food these prehistoric Englishmen depended mainly on sheep, cattle, and the collection of shellfish.

The early men of Africa were hunters and gatherers. [2] Large herds of food animals existed everywhere. From about 10,000 B.C. to 4000 B.C. hunting was their major source of food. These hunters used lances, bows and arrows, and axes for killing; gouges, scrapers and bone needles for butchering the carcasses and processing skins for clothing. Feathers, bones and mineral dyes were used for adornment.

In America and the New World, the end of the Old Stone Age was reached considerably later than in most other areas of the world. There is no indisputable evidence that man even reached the Western Hemisphere prior to 10,000 B.C. [98-11] The earliest Paleolithic hunter-fisher cultures of the New World were apparently in Peru about 8500 B.C., [98-6] and shortly thereafter in the American Southwest, near the modern city of Albuquerque. While the Peruvians ate fish, shellfish, and sea lion meat, the North Americans subsisted entirely on the bison native to the area. Evidence of human occupation in the Kanawha Valley near St. Albans, West Virginia, has been recently described. As yet nothing is known of their culture, which goes back at least to 7000 B.C. As long ago as 6500 B.C., Paleolithic Indians of

Colorado subsisted entirely on the then plentiful bison of the plains area, which they slew in wholesale fashion by stampeding the animals over a precipice and into a gully where they were butchered. [98-11] In that particular climate the meat was thought to remain edible for about a month without preservation. Even before this, about 9000 B.C., Paleo-Indian groups roamed the great plains of America, wantonly killing the huge Columbian mammoth to the point of extinction. This gross overkill was thought to be the reason for the disappearance of about 70% of the great Pleistocene mammals.

The Folsom culture, [52] pure hunters, has been dated by Carbon-14 as existing about 8000 B.C. in Western Texas and New Mexico. [96-9] While the inhabitants of Bat Cave, New Mexico, by 2000 B.C. had begun to grow a primitive type of maize with pods scarcely an inch long, archaeological data strongly indicate a sudden change in food procurement techniques in Central New Mexico about 1200 B.C., when bison hunting replaced small game hunting and the maize cultivation of that area. [96-4]

A pre-desert civilization of Southern California, [96-10] which will probably be ultimately dated at about 7000 B.C., existed near present San Diego. Archaeological material recovered suggests a hunting people who utilized game, shellfish, and other marine animals for food. The Paleolithic way of life apparently continued for at least 1500 years before milling stones began to appear among the other artifacts.

Indians of the San Francisco area were dependent for food upon sea mammals, fish, shellfish, acorns, small game (which was abundant), insects, certain seeds, and seaweed as a source of salt. [4] No crops of any sort were found by the Spanish when they arrived about the time of the Revolutionary War to establish a mission there. While these simple foods sufficed for the natives, the Spanish suffered from hunger and starvation if their imported foods failed to arrive. [37] That this simple primitive diet was adequate as shown by the fact that among nearly 5,000 natives examined by the Spanish, only thirty cases of chronic illness, blindness, lameness, or mental disease were found.

Seventy-five years later, the gold-seeking 49'ers in the

area of Mt. Lassen found the Yahi Indians subsisting happily on salmon from the numerous streams, deer and small game, and gathered acorns. In the spring, tender clover was incorporated with deer meat as a stew. [18]

While primitive agriculture appeared among the Indians of the Southwest United States, Mexico, and South America, possibly as early as 2000 to 4000 B.C., the remainder of North America retained a hunting culture until about the time of Christ, when the Adena and Hopewell agriculturists appeared in the Ohio and Mississippi valleys. [98-3] While corn was cultivated, these farming cultures continued to depend heavily on deer, rabbit, turkey, fish, turtles, and shellfish, and gathered seasonal nuts, hackberry, and wild plum.

In the Puget Sound area, Indians of the Ozette tribe lived in what is now Clallam County, Washington. They subsisted almost entirely on seafood, which ranged all the way from whales, sea lions, seals, and sea otter to clams, mussels, and sea urchins. [107-3] While fish undoubtedly contributed a major portion of their food, their fragile remains were not found among the excavated artifacts. The foregoing diet is thought to have been in vogue among these folk up to 1892. Homesteaders arriving in the rain forest of the Olympic Peninsula in 1890 found the natives of that area harpooning whales and seals, fishing the ocean and rivers, and hunting elk and deer in the adjacent forest. [48] During appropriate seasons hunting and fishing camps were established, and the game thus secured was smoked and dried to preserve it. There were no cultivated crops.

One of the earliest known Eskimo cultures was in the Bering Strait area, about 3000 B.C. These were the Denbigh people. [96-5] They were assuredly carnivorous in their dietary habits, since no carbohydrate in any form was available to them.

Civilization in the Tehuacan Valley of Mexico began with bands of hunters, who gradually settled in larger communities and became friends and craftsmen over a course of twelve thousand years. [98-2] At first the hunters lived on animals and by "gathering." From about 6700 B.C. to 5000 B.C. these people shifted from predominant hunters to collectors of plant food. About 5000 B.C. a new phase was inaugu-

rated with the domestications of corn and more abundant varieties of plant foods. Still, at that time, only about 10% of the food came from cultivated sources. By 3400 B.C. agriculture provided 30% of the food consumed and domesticated animals first appeared.

Because soils and climate were not favorable for the cultivation of abundant food crops in Chile and Peru, early arrivals in South America remained principally carnivorous in their food habits, relying chiefly upon the abundant marine life in the coastal areas as well as the hunting of game in the mountains. At certain seasons a species of snail abounded in the coastal lowlands, furnishing an important source of food. [98-6] In most areas of South America edible plant foods such as potato, sweet potato, beans, gourds, and squashes, grew wild and furnished Peruvians with food to be had for the gathering. Formal farming, however, [52] did not appear much before 2500 B.C.

While the foregoing constitutes but a very small part of our knowledge about Paleolithic and Mesolithic man, it is sufficient to allow us a reasonable belief that he ate a purely carnivorous diet for more than a million years, all during the Ice Age. He departed from this diet very slightly and then only from necessity. This first departure was not before about 8000 years ago at the earliest, and was much later in many areas of the world. We cannot call this first change in his choice of food a dietary revolution. It was merely a timid experiment to augment his food supply of flesh during periods of famine with other substances from a more dependable source, which could be stored without spoilage and, while not particularly palatable or nutritious, did offer surcease to his hungry belly. There is no doubt that man's digestive tract accepted this very minor change of viands in full stride, and without complaint.

Long before this, however, man had become a thinking and logical animal, with the imagination to envision tools and the ability to make and use them. Relief of hunger by gathering a handful of wild grain, edible roots, etc., from the sparse growth over the countryside naturally consumed much of his time. The hunting and killing of a diminishing supply of agile small game was also time-consuming and not

always successful. There had to be an easier way to accomplish all this. It was inevitable that he would soon learn to cultivate his wild grains in plots for easy harvesting; that he would learn to capture and tame certain of the wild game he hunted, and confine them where long arduous hunts would not be necessary for their use as food.

In other words, man was thinking of become a farmer!

This change would cause a greater alteration in the human environment and diet, but one to which man could comfortably adjust.

Chapter 9

A FARMER IS BORN AND INVENTS CARBOHYDRATE (A Greater Ecological Change)

The Neolithic era signaled the beginning of agriculture. It did not occur simultaneously all over the earth. For instance, farming had begun and flourished for four thousand years in Southwest Asia before it was even introduced into Britain about 2500 B.C.

For the first time in his existence man was now a food producer as well as a food consumer. The obvious purpose of this new activity was to increase the amount of food available for his nutritional needs; the obvious stimulus was hunger, and an unexpected complication was civilization.

There is general agreement among authorities that food producing began in an area called the Fertile Crescent, that region forming the western shore of the Mediterranean and extending eastward to the Caspian Sea and the Persian Gulf. It was here that cereal grasses grew profusely and wild animals susceptible to domestication roamed the hills. Great fertility and plentiful moisture also promised from this land a maximum crop yield, for a minimal investment of labor and farming knowledge.

The earliest crops consisted of emmer wheat grown chiefly in the Upper Jordan watershed, and the einkorn vari-

ety in Southeast Turkey. Barley eventually was grown abundantly over the entire Fertile Crescent. Flax, while cultivated, was not an important food. A few leguminous crops completed the list of cultivated foods [23] [96-6] in 7000 B.C.

The starting date for agriculture here varies between 14,000 to 8000 B.C. and 4000 B.C., according to different sources. Most agree on 7000 B.C., and this estimate is supported by Carbon-14 dating, as well as evidence of late Magdalenian cave art which, about that time, first included domestic flora along with the depicted fauna. [23]

Probably the most sophisticated of man's early agricultural societies was that of the Ubaid, [52] which flourished in the Valley of the Two Rivers (Tigris and Euphrates) about 4000 B.C., destined later to become the first true civilization in the world. It would be known as the Sumerian civilization of Mesopotamia. The farming achievements of the Ubaid included the domestication of cows, sheep, goats and pigs. Fish was a staple article of diet. Barley was grown and pounded in mortars. Thus it would appear that the most advanced people in the world, as late as 4000 B.C., still ate a predominantly carnivorous diet.

Unfortunately, even while Neolithic men were gaining this precarious toehold as farmers, climatic changes in the wake of the receding final glaciation caused a slow but inexorable desiccation of the Fertile Crescent. [23] This aridity began about 7000 years ago, [96-18] and was complete by the fourth millennium B.C. A consequent decline in crop yields was furthered by a second unfortunate circumstance—the gradual exhaustion of unfertilized fields. Faced with still a third adversity, a very significant population increase (from 100,000 in 8000 B.C. to several million in 4000 B.C.), [85-2] men found themselves unable to feed not only their families but their livestock, in what was rapidly becoming an unfriendly environment.

They responded to their misfortunes by abandoning two-thirds of them. They moved, taking with them their embryonic civilization, their agricultural know-how, their cereal seed grain, and their domestic animals.

Their departure was gradual, in small groups from time

to time, and took place over a span of four thousand years. Their migratory wanderings in search of greener pastures were to occupy many centuries before all of the various bands were to become settled in their ultimate homelands.

The exodus followed four different routes. [23] [52]

The first of these was along the Southern Mediterranean to Egypt and the Nile delta, thence to the fertile lowlands of Fayum and finally to Libya. A second followed the Danube to central Europe, while a third chose to follow the North Mediterranean to Greece and Italy. The fourth route was to the East and eventually reached India.

The migrants to Egypt soon found developing in North Africa the same aridity they had left behind in the Fertile Crescent. While a few chose to remain grouped around the Nile and other rivers, or inland lakes and oases, the majority moved again, crossing the Mediterranean to Spain, and thence to France and Switzerland. From there they reached Scandinavia, England, and Ireland by sea.

Table III indicates the approximate dates when farming began or arrived in various areas of the world. It is of interest that it required about two thousand years to spread from the Fertile Crescent to Egypt, and an additional three thousand years from there to Scandinavia and North England.

With the advent of agriculture, man did not immediately possess a full spectrum of domesticated plants and animals. Progress in husbandry was agonizingly slow and uncertain, occupying many centuries of the Neolithic Age before even the crudest agriculture, as judged by modern standards, was achieved.

How very slowly this new economy did develop may be realized by a brief examination of foods eaten by some societies prior to the Bronze Age.

In Southwest Asia, [96-6] only two of fifteen villages dating to 8000 B.C. were found to give evidence of domestic plants or animals. Agriculture at that time included only primitive low-yield emmer wheat and two-row barley. Sheep and goats were the only domestic animals. Three thousand years later, by 5000 B.C., hybrid cereal grain had been de-

TABLE III

DATES FOR THE ORIGIN (OR ARRIVAL) OF FARMING
IN VARIOUS AREAS OF THE WORLD

Area		Date of Origin or Arrival
Fertile Crescent	Originated	7000 B.C.
Egypt		
Nile Delta	Arrived	5000-4000 B.C.
Fayum County	Arrived	4000 B.C.
Greece	Arrived	6000 B.C.
India	Arrived	4000 B.C.
England		
South	Arrived	4000 B.C.
North	Arrived	2500 B.C.
Ireland	Arrived	2000 B.C.
Switzerland-Austria	Arrived	2000 B.C.
Sweden-Denmark	Arrived	2500 B.C.
Peru	Originated	5000-1000 B.C.
China	Originated	2000 B.C.
Mexico	Originated	4000 B.C.
New Mexico	Originated	A.D. 450
Ohio-Mississippi Valley	Originated	2000 B.C.

veloped, and cattle and pigs had been added to the roster of animals.

By 7000 B.C. Natufians living on the slopes of Mount Carmel, [52] while still relying chiefly on hunting and fishing for food, had become primitive farmers who reaped cultivated grain with stone sickles. They also herded domestic animals.

Somewhat later, at Jarmo in northern Iraq, domestication of certain animals was accomplished and crops of primitive wheat were harvested. A similar farming society was described at Jericho, which was destined to give rise to the earliest city in history.

The first Neolithic settlement in Greece was situated on the Macedonian plains. [98-4] This village was called Nea Nikomedeia, and Carbon-14 dating places its age at 6220 B.C. This is possibly the site of the earliest domestication of cattle. The inhabitants raised wheat, barley, lentils, and tended sheep, goats, pigs, and cattle. They supplemented their domestic food production by hunting deer, hare, wild pigs, fowl, and by fishing.

Beginning about 4000 B.C., farming in the Fayum County region of Egypt flourished for about eight hundred years until the lakes and oases began to dry up. [23] These Egyptians were skilled hunters and fishers, killing large mammals such as the elephant and hippopotamus, as well as gazelles and wild pigs. Fish were caught in nets as well as by hook and line. Other fresh water sea foods included mussels, turtles, snails, and crocodiles. Cereals were limited to barley and wheat, harvested by hand and stored in granaries. Grain was ground, mixed with water, and either boiled into a porridge or baked in flat sheets. The discovery of leavening by means of yeast about 2000 B.C. is credited to the Egyptians, and doubtless stimulated development of the first baking industry. Apparently the Fayumi never did discover that even more spectacular things would have happened had their yeast been mixed with grape juice or rye and allowed to ferment. Domestic animals of this time included sheep, goats, oxen, pigs, and dogs.

Somewhat to the north and west, Libya cultivated vineyards and olive trees. In addition to the diet of the Fayumi,

the Libyans consumed ostrich and greater amounts of sea foods.

Earliest Neolithic food of India [23] about 4000 B.C. consisted of wheat, barley, millet, and rice as cereal grains, fruits such as pears, peaches, dates, plums and citrus, melons and grapes, both wild and cultivated. Sugar cane apparently originated in the swamps of Mesopotamia and India. The earliest Hindus knew of the sweetish juice of this plant and added crude sugar to the food inventory. Meat sources were both wild and domestic, such as antelope, gazelle, cattle, pigs, dog, sheep, and buffalo. India domesticated the red jungle hen, thus presenting the chicken and omelette to the world. Locally caught fish and turtles were eaten fresh and quantities of dried fish were imported from the Arabian sea. In spite of a vigorous agriculture, the Hindus continued to rely heavily on wild game.

The rather advanced Neolithic culture of the Harappans of India was ended abruptly about 1500 B.C., [98-9] some say by repeated floodings of the Indus river, while others lay the blame squarely on the shoulders of the neighboring invasive Aryans.

From a piecemeal description of these invaders from the Iranian plateau, they appeared to be likeable fellows, probably not unlike your neighbor down the street. The men drank too much, gambled on anything that moved, never backed down from a fight, and were devotees of horse racing. They were dedicated family men who kept their females constantly *enceinté*, and limited the grain fields where they were allowed to exercise to a size consistent with a plentiful supply of mead and ale. An Aryan's wealth was measured by the number of sheep, goats, and cattle he possessed. Land was of secondary importance to these nomadic folk. In addition to meat, domestic animals furnished dairy products. Horses were used in hunting wild game, racing, and making war on neighboring tribes. It is suspected that a Tartar influence had suggested still another industry for the Aryan horse: production of mare's milk, to be fermented into *koumiss*.

In China the Neolithic age did not begin until about 2000 B.C., at which time cattle-breeding was practiced and

some cereal grown. [23] Six hundred years later, in the valley of the Yellow River, the city of Anyang had risen, and rice, as well as millet, was cultivated. Sheep and goats had been domesticated and the water buffalo was used in plowing the large rice fields. Chicken and ducks were eaten but the pig remained the chief food animal.

By 2000 B.C. the migrants following the Danube from the Fertile Crescent to Central Europe had settled in Switzerland and surrounding Alpine countries. They cultivated the usual cereal grains and harvested apples and beans. Dairy products, wild game, and fish completed their food sources. Danish foods of the same period consisted of the ubiquitous barley and wheat with seasonal harvests of berries, cherries, and apples. [96-2] [98-1] Domestic animals furnished meat, dairy products, and eggs. Wild game, fish, and shellfish rounded out the list of food available.

Neolithic farmers reached Sweden about 2500 B.C. They raised cattle, cultivated grain (chiefly barley), fished and hunted. [88-8] Sometime after 2000 B.C. Scandinavia was invaded by other peoples from the south and southeast and thereafter, about 1000 B.C., native art began to depict typical Viking ships. These Vikings cultivated rye, barley, oats, and some wheat. Domestic animals were the horse, ox, pig, cat, and dog. An important crop was hay, reaped and stored for winter forage. Coast dwellers ate polar bears, seal and whales. To the north, agriculture was not prominent. Cattle, sheep and goats were grazed during the summer. Bear, elk, deer, wild boar, bison, and reindeer furnished winter subsistence. Vikings ate twice daily and used plates, spoons and knives, but no forks. Staple menus included unleavened (barley) bread, a variety of boiled meats, herring, milk, cheese, butter and hazelnuts. [88-8] Vegetables were cabbage and onion, and apples and berries were eaten when available. Mead, beer, and wine were used to celebrate special occasions.

Agriculture in Britain was described by Caesar (55 B.C.) [52] as "the people of the interior [of England] do not, for the most part, cultivate grain, but live on milk and meat, and are clothed in skins." While such was true for northern England, it was quite different south of the Jurassic belt, [23]

where as early as 1000 B.C. barley, wheat, and rye were cultivated, cattle, sheep, and pigs were pastured, and fish, shellfish, game, and seasonal fruits and nuts were consumed. It was in southern England that the greatest emphasis was placed on the raising of grain. The fragile wooden plow, pulled by women of the village and capable of little more than stirring up the dust of a field, was replaced by heavier implements of more sophisticated design, pulled by oxen and capable of turning over and aerating the soil. This allowed cultivation of large fields rather than small plots, increased the amount of cereal crops for man's own nutrition, and in addition provided grain, alfalfa, and other forage crops for his animals. The latter responded with increases in weight, quality of protein and dairy products, and reproductivity. With increased awareness of rule-of-thumb genetics new breeds developed and animal husbandry flourished, making Englishmen less dependent upon plant substances for their own nutrition, an attitude persisting almost to the present era.

In the Americas, farming originated much earlier south of the Rio Grande. In fact, the Paleolithic persisted in much of North America up to the last two or three centuries, and in some isolated communities of Alaska and northern Canada even to the present. (See Chapter 12.)

The Peruvian coast [98-6] supported a number of primitive Neolithic societies as early as 8500 B.C. This region was (and is) quite arid during the summer months and capable of supporting little vegetation or herbivorous animal life. During the winter, however, (April to December), heavy fogs rolling in from the ocean brought moisture to "fog meadows," called *lomas*, and vegetation then supported certain forms of animal life, especially the snails upon which the former Old Stone Age people depended for nutrition at that season. The adjacent Peru current furnished an abundance of marine animals—fishes, shellfish, shore birds, and sea mammals. It was thought that highlanders descended from their summer homes in the mountains during these favorable winters, establishing first temporary camps and later fishing villages, which they occupied until the onset of the dry season. Remains of coastal villages dated from 3600 B.C. have been

identified. By 2500 B.C. these people had progressed from hunter-fisher-gatherers to include some farming in their culture. Crops were cotton and squash, which, however, were used to make nets, floats, and utensils rather than as food, except during periods when the usual largesse of the sea failed for some reason. Beans, chili peppers, guavas, potato, and sweet potato grew wild, but were also cultivated to some extent.

Good evidence has been presented that about 3000 B.C. contact between Joman fishermen from Kyushu (Japan), 8,000 miles to the west, and the Ecuadorian coast had been made. [98-7] The resulting Valdivian culture, subsisting on sea foods from ocean shores, persisted until about 1500 B.C., when the salt water inlets began to dry up and, being without sufficient food, the inhabitants migrated south and east toward the Guayas river, gradually becoming extinct.

It was about this time that maize, the peanut, and domesticated animals (llama, alpaca and guinea pig) appeared. By A.D. 500 these cultures had been supplanted by the valley farmers, who overcame the main obstacle to successful farming with intensive irrigation.

Exploration of Tehuacan Valley in Mexico has uncovered evidence of the previously mentioned bands of roving hunters dating from 10,000 B.C. or even earlier. These people subsisted largely on mice, wild horses, and gathered plant substances. [107-2] By 5000 B.C. there is evidence of wild corn being used for food, but it was not actually cultivated until about 3600 B.C. By 3400 B.C. domestic animals were being used for food. Primitive corn cobs found at La Perra, north of Mexico City, were grown about 3000 B.C. according to Carbon-14 dating. The Bat Caves of New Mexico yielded cobs with approximately the same dating. [98-2]

American Indians of the Ohio and Mississippi valleys raised corn as their sole food crop. [98-3] These were the Hopewell and Adena cultures, generally thought to be the first agricultural communities north of the Rio Grande. The Adena is dated between 100 and 800 B.C., the Hopewell somewhat later, at A. D. 100 to 500. Even these farming cultures depended heavily on hunting and gathering, for they consumed deer, fish, turtles, rabbit, turkey, hickory nuts,

acorns, walnuts, hackberry, and wild plums as a major part of their food.

Foods of the Ogillallah Indians, as late as 1846, consisted chiefly of bison, with some gathered vegetation such as nuts, cherries, plums, gooseberries and currants. [23] Some corn was cultivated. These Plains Indians preserved much of their meat in the form of pemmican (dried powdered meat and fat), in which form it served as a lightweight, high caloric ration which would keep without spoilage for years.

Obvious differences are perceptible in the agricultural techniques and foods of three areas of the world: 1) the Old World, including North Africa and India; 2) Asia (China), and 3) the New World. Since these regions are separated from one another geographically by either vast bodies of water or formidable mountain ranges, it is reasonable to conclude that each was forced to develop its own agriculture independently by utilizing only the plants and animals native to it.

Consequently the cereal grains of the Old World became wheat and barley; their domestic animals were cattle and sheep, and dairy products were prominently featured from the earliest days of farming. Asia raised millet and rice and domesticated the pig, while in the New World maize became the sole grain and food animals, because of their abundance, were hunted rather than tamed. Without domestic animals, dairy foods were unknown in pre-Columbia America.

In general, the Old World domesticated a large number of animals, but few varieties of plants. The New World cultivated many types of plants but domesticated few if any animals. China was apparently satisfied to go along with one of each, rice and the pig.

Any admixture of the indigenous animals or plants from any one of the three areas did not occur until intercontinental travel had been established, probably subsequent to A.D. 1200.

The nutritional significance of these facts is simply that up to the mid-Christian era, man got along splendidly, in perfect nutritional balance while subsisting on a simple diet of only a few varieties of food, but one in which animal protein and grains were always the chief ingredients. The foods

of any one area did not seem to be obligatory to the nutritional health of man in the other two, until they became universally available many millenniums later. Until modern times garden foods had been considered either as non-essential dietetic luxuries or as unfit for human consumption. Today they seem to have acquired a significance bordering on indispensability, for no very good reason.

It has been said that wheat, the ox, and sheep were the foundation foods of civilization. Johannes Iverson [98-1] and his co-workers demonstrated how Neolithic man accomplished his farming in Denmark. Using only Paleolithic stone tools and fire, they cleared the forests, creating pasturage for animals as well as fields where wild native wheat and barley were planted and subsequently harvested.

The original wheat was simply the large seeds growing atop spears of certain wild grasses. Two types identified with the early Neolithic. [23] The first of these, called *emmer*, was the most productive per acre but required fertile soil, moisture, and an equable climate. This was the wheat furnishing most of the bread and porridge eaten by Neolithics. A second type, known as *einkorn*, was less prolific, having but a single grain, but was also less demanding, growing well from poor soil. A third type, *spelt*, did not appear until later, probably originating from emmer as a genetic variant. All the many varieties of wheats grown today originated from these three primitive types, either as chance mutations or, much later, from selective crossing and breeding by horticulturists. Today the original three are grown sparsely, on poor soils, chiefly for cattle feed.

Early Neolithic wheat fields contained many weeds, among which oats and rye were eventually cultivated for their own value. The latter was found to make excellent bread and became one of the important grains of Europe. The oat, since it was most difficult to separate the kernel from its enveloping husk, was unpalatable and indigestible by man, and served primarily as animal feed until more modern methods of processing rendered it suitable for human use.

Barley has always been a close second to wheat in popularity. It lacks gluten, however, and for this reason, bakes

poorly. When yeast leavening was discovered, barley came to be used chiefly in beer-making and as animal food.

Where and how rice originated is uncertain. It appeared in both China and India about 2800 B.C. Like barley, rice lacks gluten and bakes poorly. Its cultivation requires flooded fields and a hot climate. In spite of this demand for a precise environment, rice today is the staple cereal grain of more people than any other.

Millet flour was of importance as a human food only in China and India. In these areas its use continues to the present. In other areas it is grown as a forage crop.

Mention of the discovery and improvement of maize by the New World peoples completes the list of cereal grains of the Neolithic Age. It is of more than passing interest that discovery and domestication by these primitive farmers of the Neolithic included every cereal grain that is under cultivation today.

While wheat and domestic animals were the springboard to civilization, the cereal grains alone specifically triggered a most significant advance—the use of fire for cooking—which in turn made necessary the invention of pottery.

The reason for this is quite obvious.

Since the purpose of farming was to serve a single need—to augment a dwindling food supply—it would indeed be futile to discover and cultivate new foods if they could not be digested and assimilated by man. Cereal grains as they occur in nature cannot be digested by man, a carnivorous animal, without being processed in some manner, as was previously mentioned.

Without doubt hungry man's first experiment with wheat as a food was to strip the ripe grains from a spear of cereal grass, pop them into his mouth, possibly chomp once or twice, and swallow before he could be upset by their taste. For a short time his hunger pangs were somewhat alleviated. His next experience was to observe his bowel passage a day or two later, seeing therein each and every one of the grains, intact and undigested.

A handful of wheat grains and the soul of a gastro-enterologic researcher are the only requirements to repeat this experiment today.

Man again was faced with a choice: either abandon the use of grain as a food, or discover some way to render it nutritious. His next move was to think some more. He remembered the comfortable sensation from his empty stomach after ingesting the grains, and set about continuing his experiments.

It was inevitable that he pulverize the grains between two stones and that he bring this crude flour or the grains themselves in contact with heat. Possibly he mixed some flour with water and placed the dough on a hot stone near his fire, discovering bread. Perhaps a natural depression in a stone might have served as the world's first boiling pot after the entire stone had become hot, or if hot stones were dropped into the depression. These so-called "boiler pots" originated in the Near East about 6000 to 4000 B.C. Basketry was probably the next step in cooking, by affording a receptacle in which grain, water, and hot stones could be united. Herodotus describes such hot stone cookery among the Scythians about 500 B.C. The next step was smearing the baskets with clay so they could be placed directly in the fire, followed by the evolution of true pottery at about 3000 B.C. in western Europe.

Man's ingenuity again had bested Nature by converting to his own digestive capability the cereal grains designed for use only by the herbivorous beasts of the field.

Originally the domestication of animals, except for the cat and dog, was to furnish a more reliable and convenient source of food animals. Since meat was the food of choice and because it required no processing to render it palatable and nutritious, animal husbandry progressed very rapidly. The scope of this facet of Neolithic agriculture is apparent from the fact that much tillage was devoted to production of foods for their animals (alfalfa, clover, root crops), and that forest clearance was divided between grain field and pasturage. In addition to ready availability, domestic animals possessed other advantages over wild game. The domestic animals were larger, thus affording more meat per carcass. They were fatter than their untamed cousins and, in most instances, contributed valuable nutriments in the form of dairy

products. Their use as draft animals and beasts of burden was a later unexpected dividend.

The dog was probably the first animal to associate intimately with man, the relationship extending back to 9000 B.C. The dog's skill at hunting small game animals was soon eclipsed by a much more important talent—the instinct to herd and control bands of larger animals, such as sheep and goats. This doubtlessly explains why the Mesopotamian wild sheep were next in line for domestication after the dog. While eaten for food in certain tribes, or when faced with starvation, the dog has never been considered by man universally as a food animal.

The most successfully domesticated large animals were the ruminants. Sheep, able to subsist on poor scrub forage, prolific and able to contribute dairy foods as well as meat, have persisted prominently in the annals of animal husbandry. The use of wool for clothing belongs to a later age.

All cattle are probably descended from an original strain of wild oxen which lived in India and adjacent areas of the Fertile Crescent. A ruminant, like the sheep, these animals could subsist on the poorest scrub foliage. The people migrating from the Fertile Crescent took along their cattle and sheep, thus spreading them widely over the Old World. Geographic adaptation and evolutionary changes resulted in a great many varieties of cattle even before selective breeding was envisioned and practiced by the later farmers.

The horse, as we know it today, gradually evolved from Eohippus, a Pleistocene animal the size of a dog. [12] Modern horses had developed by the Ice Age but were apparently first domesticated in Persia, about 1800 B.C. A few hundred years later they appeared in Egypt and in China. The use of horses by the Aryan tribes has already been mentioned. Its use as a draft animal, for riding, hunting, making war, and as a beast of burden, made it too valuable to eat except in time of famine. Both cattle and, to a lesser extent, the horse, contributed valuable dairy products to the Neolithic economy.

The pig originated in the swamplands of Sumeria, India, and China, where its descendants still root through the reed beds and swamps in a wild state. They were not domesti-

cated in Egypt until the early Dynastic period, about 3200 B.C. For some reason taboos against pork arose in many Neolithic areas, except in China, where the pig has continued as the chief and favorite food animal to the present time.

The camel is not a meat animal but was domesticated for a beast of burden. Its role in helping establish early commerce cannot be ignored. The male, because of its unpredictable bad temper, cannot be used as a pack animal. The female, in addition to being a pack animal, simultaneously furnishes milk of unusual richness for her driver. [65-1]

Chief among domestic birds is the chicken. Both as a producer of eggs and as a source of meat, this animal has figured prominently in nutritional history to the present. When domestic duck, goose, and the New World turkey appeared on the food-producing horizon is uncertain.

In the New World the llama, alpaca, and guinea pig were domesticated in South America. For the most part, other domestic animals were imported from the Old World, and did not appear until long after the birth of Christ.

Dairy animals [23] of the past have included cows, goats, mares, asses, camels, reindeer, and zebras. The Sumerians had developed a dairy industry by 3000 B.C. Milk, in the absence of refrigeration, was usually drunk in the soured state or used to make cheese. Butter was possible only in colder climates, where curdling could be prevented until the butterfat had separated from the milk. Certain regions, such as the Swiss Lakes and the Netherlands, became noted for their cheese. Camel milk is very high in fat but cannot be used to produce cheese or butter.

These, then, were man's foodstuffs as discovered and developed over the span of some five thousand years of the Neolithic Age. During his progress in food producing, however, equally great strides were made in man's social and community life. That growth of the latter aspect of his civilization was intimately related to agriculture may be seen by examining his various cultures and how each had prepared itself to leave the Neolithic Age and participate, to varying degrees, in the vastly more exciting and sophisticated Late Bronze Age and the succeeding Iron Age.

Earlier in this chapter several farming communities were described. These particular examples were chosen with an ulterior motive, for they illustrate the four types of food-producing cultures that emerged from the Neolithic.

The first of these, barely Neolithic according to definition, practiced only minimal agriculture, did not domesticate animals, and in general continued a Mesolithic hunting-fishing-gathering existence. These were, of course, the early Neolithics of Peru. A similar and even more primitive society is that of the North American Indians living in the San Francisco Bay area, which persisted until the middle eighteenth century of the Christian era. Still other Stone Age groups exist even today.

The second type was a true food-producing culture which, however, confined its food production to stock breeding and herding, showing little interest in the raising of crops. These folk developed a life which has been described as pastoral nomadism, and are exemplified by the Aryans of the Iranian plateau. They had no fixed communities and remained mobile, invasive, and warlike. These cultures had little appreciation for community life. They failed to create any urban civilization and even destroyed that founded by others by burning captured cities and leaving them in ruins.

A third type of Neolithic culture is called "hoe farming." Crops were simple, usually grain, grown in small plots and planted seed by seed in holes punched in the unplowed earth with dibble sticks. Yields were small and food dependence was primarily on wild and domestic animals. These farmers settled in villages such as those found in the Fayum County region of Egypt. Their villages were semi-permanent, being readily abandoned when the community offal became embarrassing.

Field farming is the designation given the final type of Neolithic agriculture. This advanced type of farming began about 3000 B.C. in Mesopotamia, and was responsible for the cities of Jericho, Jarmo, Ur, and Babylon. In China the city of Anyang, and its sister metropolis Chengchou, arose on a foundation of field farming in about 1400 B.C. In Britain field farming was well established, as already described by 1000 B.C., the beginning of the Bronze Age in that country.

The technique of field farming, by greatly increasing the production of grain and food animals, allowed a few to raise sufficient food to nourish a great many. The great many found occupations in the cities, thus starting the migration to urban centers. It may now be seen that the field farmers laid the foundation for the next great advance of civilization—the era of the cities and industrialization. The field farming people were the only Neolithic culture capable of participating in these changes to modernization to an appreciable degree.

The beginning of urbanization, the dawn of industrialization, and the development of food processing and refining made necessary by these innovations, all combined to revolutionize man's dietary practices to a greater degree in a few centuries than had taken place in the previous million years.

Chapter 10

MAN BECOMES CITIFIED, HIS DIET INDUSTRIALIZED (Human Ecology Becomes Strained)

As has been observed, so long as man had to subsist by hunting animals, birds, eggs, insects, and plant materials, he was limited to living in small groups. [52] Farming led to life in villages, but not all societies accepted this new way of life. For instance, in the highlands of Asia, Asia Minor, and Iran, the inhabitants wanted no part of digging in the dirt or backbreaking toil for a few grains of wheat. These folk concentrated on animal husbandry and became our friends the Aryans, predatory feudists, as they gradually came to be known. In general, where wild game abounded agriculture was late in arriving—there was really little need for it.

It is easy to understand why hunting cultures, with no investment of labor in houses, fields, or orchards, would choose to move on with the seasonal migration of the birds and animals, possibly in search of a more pleasant or prolific hunting ground or, perhaps as do his modern descendants, merely to satisfy a nebulous yearning for some primitive Utopia. They felt secure without roots in the ground or a permanent abode.

However, when the first farmer made his down payment of sweat and hope on a patch of cultivated soil, and husbanded a brace of mangy goats, he acquired shackles that

were to lock him to the soil far past his foreseeable future. As his animals multiplied, prospered, and became more dependent upon him, and as his garden plots flourished to become fields and orchards, he was the more firmly bound, virtually enslaved to a way of life offering only one advantage: a full belly at reasonably predictable and frequent intervals.

Since he could no longer pick up and move along on impulse, he ensconced his family in a sturdy and permanent house, which was grouped with others for mutual protection in a village.

With the productive efficiency of field farming, just a few farmers were able to feed a great number of the citizenry. Those of the village thus left with time on their hands turned to other occupations, gradually specializing along two lines of endeavor—technological and political. Some of the former continued as agricultural aides at harvest time and in maintaining irrigation systems; others became occupied with trivial municipal chores, while a very few became entrepreneurs to the infant pottery industry. The politicians probably did nothing but plan how they would become indispensable to the community when it became large enough to warrant a leader.

With the appearance of metallurgy and writing (3000 B.C.), the technical workers ramified their talents into many specialized fields, their ranks being augmented by itinerant craftsmen who established industries and bazaars within the villages, and commerce between neighboring communities.

To maintain order within this increasingly complicated society, it was inevitable that certain individuals would rise to a position of command. [98-5] The ruling power was usually reinforced by the ideology of divine right, and for many centuries the king was also the religious leader of the community.

Since this political figure, his family, servants, underlings and lesser officials, and their families raised no food, it was necessary that a governmental system be put into effect with sufficient authority to levy a tax of their agricultural produce against the farmers. The scriveners had mastered cuneiform to a degree sufficient for tax rolls and the keeping of payment records.

As non-agrarian citizens increased in numbers, their commerce and bazaars required more than payment in kind. The king created currency.

A long way back, in the quiet village, the politician sitting under the palm tree had not been dreaming. He had been thinking, and exceedingly well.

The functioning of such an early municipal system is revealed in the Babylonian economy (*vide infra*).

These early cities do not compare with present concepts of "great cities." The first cities of southwest Asia, in 5000 B.C., were less than one hectare (2.741 acres) [96-6] and numbered one hundred to three hundred citizens. A thousand years later the villages, or cities, had doubled in size. By 2500 B.C. the city of Harappa, in the valley of the Indus River, was about a mile square and numbered forty thousand inhabitants. [98-9] Contemporary cities of Khafajah (100 acres), Ur (165 acres), and Uruk (1,200 acres) were thought to have populations up to 34,000 people, although other estimates place this figure much lower, from five thousand to ten thousand. The largest Old World city up to the Middle Ages was Rome, with 300,000 citizens.

The New World Mayan city of Tikal had an area of about six square miles and contained some three thousand structures, about two-thirds of them dwellings. The population of Tikal was thought to be at least five thousand. Probably the largest American urban site was the city of Teotihuacan, near modern Mexico City, which, during the first millennium A.D., covered an area of sixteen square miles and had about 100,000 population. [98-5]

The urban revolution was greater than the agricultural revolution in its effect on man's diet, for life in the cities made necessary the invention of two new industries: food processing (refining), and food preservation. Both of these were to affect the availability and quality of his foodstuffs.

Obviously a city dweller could not raise his own grain and animals in the home; hence the community architecture became an urban area surrounded by fields and pastures. Since product and consumer had to be brought together, transportation of food to city markets was necessary. As it was harvested, grain and other agricultural products con-

tained much waste material, and therefore were bulky and difficult to transport. Threshing was an adequate solution of this problem, at least for the moment, and became the first effort toward food refining.

Grinding the grain to flour remained a tiresome chore for city folk, whose only motive power was their own muscle. In the fields animal muscles were available and, more important, the forces of wind and water. Flour instead of grain began to appear in the marketplace, a second step in food refining.

When professional millers, bakers, and yeast all came together, the use of wheat skyrocketed and competition bloomed. Millers learned that further refining of flour made finer, lighter, whiter bread; that it stripped much protein from the kernel was not appreciated, [57-1] and actually was not of vital nutritional importance, so long as adequate supplies of animal protein continued. People ate more bread and business was good for the baker, the miller, and the farmer.

In China a similar processing of rice made it more palatable and digestible, and in addition less prone to spoilage. The nutritional deficiencies thus engendered played hob with many a Chinaman for years before their true nature was discovered.

Unrefined sugar cane is practically valueless as a human food. Commercial production of sugar, a pure carbohydrate, is a relatively modern industry. Crude methods up to the industrial era (1845), limited its use to negligible amounts. [108-13]

Processing of grains, fruits, and grapes by fermentation produced alcohol, a compact substance of high caloric value. High caloric oils were pressed from olives and sesame. Dairy products were for the most part processed by the natural souring of sweet milk, separation of curds from whey, and the compression of the former into cakes. In some instances collection of milk fats allowed the manufacture of butter. Again, processing of milk accomplished the compression of a bulky, unstable commodity into a small volume, with high caloric value and excellent keeping qualities.

From the foregoing it may be seen that, with the exception of dairy products, processing and refining were applied

to plant substances only. Their purpose was not to preserve but to rid the natural food of roughage with no food value, thus reducing the edible parts to a small concentrated mass easily transported and stored.

While cooking, the first attempt to process food was necessary to render vegetable foods assimilable; all later procedures were purely for the sake of convenience. They resulted in a marked increase of carbohydrate utilization merely because of increased availability and ease of preparation.

Quite different was the contemporary industry of food preservation. This treatment of foods was limited largely to protein substances. [23] Such was made necessary because meat, fish, and eggs become putrid if not consumed while fresh. During the Paleolithic Age, when small animals were killed and consumed on the spot, or larger carcasses were set upon by entire tribes and dispatched in short order, the problem of spoilage was not important. With the rise of cities and the lack of refrigeration, some method was essential to prolong the period of edibility. This was particularly true in the case of fish being transported long distances in warm weather to the cities.

The use of sun or fire-dried fish in commerce had been mentioned as well as salting as a preservative by 1000 B.C. Pickling of meat in brine, especially pork, was practiced in Athens (500 B.C.) and in Rome (100 B.C.). Smoke, oil and clay were less common preservatives. All of these methods, particularly salting, decreased the quality of protein and the nutrients of fresh meat, fish, and eggs to a significant degree. [23]

From a nutritional viewpoint, life in cities accomplished a more abundant food supply but tended to increase the amount of carbohydrate consumed, with a concurrent relative decrease in protein and some damage to the vitamin content and nutritional quality of the latter.

However, through all this busy preoccupation, with the production, refining, and preservation of food, men continued to ingest more than adequate amounts of their favored viands—meat, fish, eggs, and fermented dairy products. This may be observed in a brief description of a few urban

societies up to mid-Christian times in Europe and Columbian times in America.

Field farming in Mesopotamia began about 3600 B.C., made possible by the construction of widespread irrigation canals. [23] Coincidentally there was a spectacular increase in population and the appearance of cities within the fertile crescent. The first of these was Jericho, the largest Ur, and the best known was Babylon.

At the height of Babylonian culture, typical for 2500 B.C., wheat and barley were the cereal grains, the large fields being plowed by oxen. [23] Metallurgy was confined to bronze and a few precious metals. The city ruler was king as well as high priest. Tribute was exacted from the farmers, many of whom were serfs or tenant farmers, and was stored in the temples. Food animals were kept in pens until slaughtered. This arrangement enabled Babylonia to successfully resist the onslaught of predatory tribesmen and attempted invasion by more sophisticated foes. Skilled artisans worked with precious gems and metals. Commerce with distant areas was carried on by a class of merchant-traders who disposed of finished products and returned bearing raw materials.

Sesame was grown for its oil, while other cultivated plants yielded dates, figs, grapes, mulberries, onions, and other vegetables. Unleavened bread was made of dried and pulverized fish as well as from grain. Beer, wine, and honey were consumed, but only by the aristocracy. While pork was taboo to many citizens, young fat dogs were eaten with enjoyment and without compunction. Domestic animals also included sheep and cattle. Fresh, dried, and salted fish appear to have been the chief source of protein. Beef was eaten sparingly, the cattle furnishing more abundant protein in the form of dairy products.

Herodotus, describing the foods of Assyria two thousand years later, mentions the great fertility of the region but lists wheat, barley, millet, and sesame as the only cultivated crops. Figs and dates grew wild and were used as food, wine, and honey (sugar). Except for the great fields of grain, agriculture was apparently no longer of primary importance,

the Assyrians subsisting chiefly on bread, fish, dogs, cheese, and wine.

The Golden Age of Greece [23] extended from 700 to 400 B.C. At about the beginning of the Age, alfalfa had been introduced from Persia for use by domestic animals. Fig, as well as other fruit and nut trees, had been transplanted. Oils, salted fish and meat, cheeses, honey, and spices were prized by the Greeks. Before the close of the Age, local sources for all these foods had been established, and in addition the Greeks had created a wine industry, as well as milling and baking professions. While dairy products were processed for the city dwellers, fresh milk was consumed in the rural areas.

The *agora* was the social as well as the marketing center of each city. [62-1] Here farmers sold or bartered vegetables, poultry, and eggs. Fish and meat were not sold at the *agora* but in separate markets.

While garden vegetables were grown in great variety, the salad was not due to appear on the gastronomic scene until late in the Roman Empire. Pork and fish were the staple proteins. Greek interest in animal feed crops denoted a flourishing animal husbandry. Mutton, beef, goat, pigs, and poultry were raised. Wild sources of meat included the wild pig, hares, game birds, and deer. By now the dog had acquired some family status, being allowed to remain under the table rather than upon it at dinner. In addition to fresh and salt water fish, the sea furnished eels, turtles and turtle eggs, tuna fish, young sharks and oysters. Preserved foods included dried and salted fish and pork, ham, sausages, and sun-dried fruits. [88-11]

A typical Athenian was an enthusiastic horseman, a connoisseur of horses, and a meticulous diner. He partook slowly of a variegated diet and never ate to excess. Mealtimes was a social occasion, and the more the merrier. He rose early, breakfasted (*akratismos*) sparingly on bread and wine. Lunch (*ariston*) consisted of fresh or salted fish, ham, or sausage. The heaviest meal of the day (*deipnon*) was eaten at sunset and consisted of meat and fish, fruits and vegetables of many sorts marinated in oil, vinegar, spices, or

honey, and cooked by boiling. Dessert was fresh or dried fruit, cheese, salted nuts, and perhaps a sweetmeat.

The typical Roman gourmand (200 B.C. to A.D. 250) contrasts rather unfavorably with the epicurean Greek, [23] for he ate and drank too fast, too long, and too much. His available foods were about the same as those of Athens. [88-11] Imports from Spain and southern Europe consisted of venison, cheese, and bacon, while oils, corn, and spices were secured from North Africa. Wine and bread were staples in Rome, the baking industry having been started about 170 B.C. By the beginning of the Christian era specialty bake shops had sprung up, making cakes, cookies, and confections. The sweetening agents for these were honey or syrup pressed from sugar cane imported from India. These sweets were luxury items restricted to a very few of the elite.

Grains were ground in mills turned by donkeys, the appearance of water power for this industry being delayed until about A.D. 400. Numerous garden vegetables were grown but were consumed almost exclusively by peasants and the lower classes of citizens. [88-3] Roman chefs specialized in the cooking of meats, and a great variety of protein foods was served at social functions and celebrations. Among the better classes it was considered an insult to serve vegetables to guests. Plebeians, partook liberally from an extensive offering of garden vegetables, the variety of which would compare favorably with those found in a modern farmer's market. Certain vegetables were consumed raw, being laced with vinegar, wines, oils, and cheeses. When eaten in this form they were called *salads*. Aristocratic Romans continued to eschew all uncooked vegetables, declaring their use to cause flatulence or impotence. (In this belief they were doubtless 50% correct.) Some cooked greens were chilled, marinated with various spiced dressings, and eaten with relish. (This concoction is most reminiscent of the "combination" salad popular in this country during the first three decades of the twentieth century.)

In Rome, and later in Europe, raw vegetables were eaten instead of taking a laxative.

Animal proteins, sold in numerous butcher shops, included domestic pigs, cattle, sheep, and goats. Many families

maintained a flock of some two hundred chickens within the city, which supplied both meat and eggs. Fish were transported from the seacoast in tanks of water, which eliminated the necessity of preserving them by salt or drying. Smoke and brine pickling was widely used in preserving pork and in making bacon, ham, and sausage available. As in Athens, the country people drank milk, the urbanites ate cheese.

The staple foods of the Roman Empire appeared to be similar in cost to the same commodities in the United States prior to the first World War.

A typical menu of the Roman Empire may be adduced from the following account of a board meeting of the Roma Chariot and Toga Company, held at the summer home of President Cerebros, in the resort city of Pompeii in the fall of the year A.D. 79. [74-25] The members of the board had wined during the afternoon, bathed, been entertained by diaphanously clad dancing girls, wined some more, and were at the moment strewn about the room in attitudes of repose.

President Cerebros opened the meeting. "Gentlemen, if you will all stop partaking of the wine for a moment and join me, we shall have dinner and proceed with the symposium."

Since no one seemed to have heard him, Cerebros poured himself another cup from the great golden flagon at his elbow and sipped reflectively.

An hour later: "Gentlemen, please, the meeting. The matter of increased salaries for the board members is first on the agenda. We must get started."

This caused a noticeable drift toward the huge banquet table.

"Here, Scriptus, you are secretary. Sit by my left and scribe the agenda papers. You, Simplictus, advertising virtuoso and paragon of mass hypnosis, on my right. Minimus, of quality control, sit across from Maximus, profit control."

A group of four stood gazing from the window at a late evening glow on the horizon. They turned to join the group at the table.

Said Gismo, chief engineer. "Sure is warm in here," slipping out of his toga.

"Sure, is," rejoined Approximos, chief accountant. "Sure is a stunning sunset."

"Sure is," agreed Perpetua, from research. "Sure taking a long time to set, though."

"Humpf," muttered Hectare, the Athens distributor. "Now in Greece we have. . ."

"Sh-h-h," cautioned Parrotus, vice-president. "Cerebros is about to speak."

Cerebros rose and lifted his goblet with a toast. Each in turn answered the toast and proposed a new one. Meanwhile a crew of servants had been placing great, steaming dishes around the table.

Cerebros proposed a last toast and, reading from a paper, intoned, "Gentlemen, the first course will be sea urchins, raw oysters, palourdes, thorny shelled oysters, larks, hen pullet with asparagus, stewed oysters, mussels, white and black sea tulips and oysters."

"What's a 'palourdes'?" queried Minimus.

"Shrimp!" sharply from Cerebros. Minimus subsided, not knowing whether he had been answered or insulted.

"Sure is hot in here," said Gismo, opening a window.

"Shut the window," chorused the company. "A lot of smog and ashes are drifting in and adding themselves to the wine."

The diners ate and drank in silence.

Finally Cerebros again rose to his feet and began the next round of toasting before the second course was served. He noted that Hectare was not drinking.

"Do you not like the wine, Hectare?"

"We typical Athenians are enthusiastic horsemen, connoisseurs of horses, meticulous diners, and temperate almost to the point of abstemiousness. Remember?"

"What, then, do you most desire?" wheedled Cerebros with perfect hostmanship.

"Well, most of all I'd like to have a nice tomato with lots of lettuce."

"Bah!" from Cerebros with obvious irritation. "*MMCXV denarii*, plus tax, I pay for this food, and you," stabbing a finger toward Hectare, "want a two-bit salad."

Approximos, startled, looked up from squinting into his

goblet and observed, "Gee, that's more than fifty bucks, American."

Hectare, miffed at being misunderstood, went to the window and stood staring at the sunset.

The servants entered with a second array of covered dishes which were placed on the table.

Cerebros again rose and as quickly sat down. "The secon' course," he announced from his chair, "will be Spondulae oysters, sweet water mussels, sea nettles, becaficoes, chicken pie, more beaficoes with saparagus sauce, orysters, chausage, sheese and fell shish."

"What's beaficoes?" queried Minimus.

"How's your brother doing with his shellfish business?" asked Maximus irrelevantly.

"Sure is hot in here," remarked Gismo, removing whatever Romans wear under their toga.

The servants refilled the wine cups.

"The third course will be . . ." came the voice of Cerebros, muffled as from a great distance. "'s dark under here and I can't see to read. Here, you take it and read the third course, Scriptus." A hand appeared, waving a slip of paper from beneath the table.

Scriptus began bravely. "The third course will be breast of parturient pig, wild boar's head, breasts of roast ducks, fricassee of wild duck, roast hare, roasted Phrygian shickens, starsh cream and cakes from Vicenza."

"What's a parturient?" asked Minimus. "Hey Scriptus, what's a . . .? Where's Scriptus gone?"

"I'm down here with Cerebros 'n Maximus 'n Simplicuss 'n Approximos 'n I dunno what's a parturient."

"I'm down here too," piped Parrotus.

Hectare turned from the window, addressing the sole person still sitting at the table, "Does it usually take eight hours for the sun to set in the Roman Empire?"

"Sure does. The sun always sets just like that," replied Minimus.

"But—in the northeast? And what's happened to the mountain that was out there when we came in?"

A loud rumble drowned out his words and all was quiet. Ashes sifted in and, unnoticed, filled the wine cups, then the

entire room, to be undisturbed for eighteen hundred years.*

Even though field farming began in England about 1000 B.C., by 800 B.C. there was little evidence of the population condensing into urban centers. Evolution of cities was much slower here than in other nations. London, at the time the Romans conquered England in A.D. 43, was hardly more than a crossroads village. This was probably because industrial emphasis was focused chiefly on the improvement of farming implements, and farming emphasis was chiefly on raising cereal grain and practicing animal husbandry. English foods of the early Christian era differed little from those described in Chapter 9, at about 1000 B.C.

With the decline of the Roman Empire, about A.D. 476, civilization regressed into the Dark Ages. The great cities of Europe shriveled and became towns, the towns became villages and these in turn atrophied to mere farming communities. People returned to the soil in great numbers to resume responsibility for their own food production, but found no vacant property. Suddenly, without powerful leadership, the people began going in circles, like a ship without a hand on the tiller, and naturally gravitated to the questionable security of becoming subservient to wealthy and powerful landowners, the so-called feudal lords.

The Dark Ages merged with the Middle Ages. Then, as though waking from a thousand-year-long night, man stepped forth into the brilliance of the Renaissance. Again the arts, crafts, and industry prospered. Christianity flourished, printing was invented, and America was discovered. Some of these events had a profound effect on the foods man ate. Agriculture became more productive and, as always in the past, carbohydrate use increased still more. Commerce with foreign lands introduced strange and exotic foods to the New World as well as to the Old. Food-preserving and refining became more widespread and vitamin deficiencies began to appear.

Early in the sixteenth century, Englishmen still ate al-

* Whimsy? To be sure. But the menu is authentic, having been excavated from the ruins of Pompeii about seventy-five years ago, and all but two of the celebrants *were found under the table*.

most nothing but beef, mutton, fish, and breads of various sorts. [88-12] They looked with scorn upon the foreigner who fed on roots, herbs, and grasses. [88-3] When Catherine of Aragon arrived in England as the first wife of Henry VIII, she was dismayed to find no salad, nor the means with which to prepare one. She is credited with introducing to England, and stimulating the use of a variety of salad greens, as well as carrots, cabbage, apricots, almonds, melons, berries, and a great number of herbs. History tells us that Catherine's successor, Anne Boleyn, had no time and interest for salads. They quietly disappeared from the English menu. By the Elizabethan Age, Englishmen had forgotten about "roots, watery herbs, and such beggary baggage," and were again happily downing beef, mutton, and fish, and munching pasties.

The Elizabethan appetite may be envisaged by examining a grocery list for victuals required for a two-day visit of the Queen and her retinue. [101-1] Listed were the following: 4,800 loaves of bread, 11 steers and oxen, 36 sheep, 17 calves, 7 lambs, 34 pigs, 4 stags, 16 bucks, 2,075 birds, 74 hogsheads of beer, 430 pounds of butter, 2,522 eggs, 1 cart-load and 2 horseloads of oysters, and 400 red herrings. Conspicuously absent from the menu were fruits, vegetables, desserts, and dairy products, other than butter.

Maize had been introduced to England and Europe but was slow in gaining favor. The potato reached the Old World in 1585 and was also slow to achieve popularity, until a slyly bruited reputation for its aphrodisiac powers became widespread. Englishmen changed their diet to beef, mutton, fish, pasties, and potato. Sugar was to remain a curiosity to the British for still another century, being limited to use as a condiment and a medicine.

In the New World, Mexican foods at the time of Cortez included a great variety of agricultural produce. [23] Urbanites ate corn, peanuts, potatoes, oranges and bananas. Protein foods consisted of guinea pig, fish, hedgehog, turkey, goose, duck, and quail. The Aztecs raised numerous small hairless dogs, eating them as rabbits are eaten today. [107-8] Many rural villages and tropical societies subsisted only on native meats and *cassava* (tapioca, manioc, or arrowroot).

Less common crop foods were tomato, squash, pumpkin, yams, gourds, kidney and lima beans, papaya, pineapple, avocado, brazil nuts and pecans, chocolate, vanilla, spices, and tobacco. Restaurants in Mexico City served chili stews made with unspecified meats, tortillas, cakes made of fly eggs, and corn cakes sweetened with honey.[23]

Agricultural patterns of the North American natives continued without great change up to and after the landing of the Pilgrims. The Indians of the Mississippi Valley raised corn, gathered wild plants, fruits, and nuts. The principal emphasis was on meat from the great bison herds, deer, fish, and wild birds. The Plains Indians to the west—the south and north having few, if any, cultivated crops—subsisted by gathering and hunting. On the West Coast the natives remained hunters and fishers, a major portion of their food coming from the plentiful marine animals. [96-17] To the southwest the Indians cultivated maize, beans, and brewed tequila, hunted large and small animals, and lived high on the bounty of the sea. [96-10]

From the preceding, food patterns showed little change up to the mid-nineteenth century. In general the diet provided high intake of good quality proteins (meat, fish, eggs, cheese, and poultry), with staple carbohydrates in the form of bread and potato, and a modest consumption of sugar. Use of salad vegetables and raw fruits was restricted to a short growing season, otherwise they were preserved by canning. Prepared cereals were unheard of. The housewife serving oatmeal for breakfast had been up since four o'clock cooking it. Bakeries existed but most breads and sweets were home-baked.

Wagon trains headed for the California gold fields in '49, or branching north to the Oregon Territory, loaded up with staples before leaving St. Louis. Foods selected were flour, beans, lard, bacon, hard tack, coffee, tea, condensed milk, and sugar. The latter item was carried in a small pouch and used sparingly on special occasions only. Many trains were accompanied by dairy cattle, furnishing milk, cheese, and butter. At least half the food was secured by hunting and fishing. Certain members of the company were usually designated to scout ahead and perform this vital chore.

However, civilization inexorably moved forward, and with it certain things changed.

Charles A. Lindberg wrote: "Wherever civilization comes, wildlife tends to disappear." This results in greater dependence on domestic meat sources, higher costs for animal protein foods, and consequent relegation of their role in the human diet to second place. In 1850 two-thirds of Americans lived on farms; [97-1] a century later only 13% remained there. It has been shown that such a shift to the cities is always accompanied by increased consumption of refined cereal products, high intake of sugar, canned goods, jams, sweetened fruits, chocolate and greatly reduced dairy products and proteins. [27] Per capita consumption of sugar jumped from fourteen pounds per year in 1840, to ninety-seven pounds in 1940. [41]

At the end of World War I, something happened in the world of science that was destined to upset man's digestive equanimity more within the space of a few years than had occurred during the previous ten thousand. Industrial tycoons, when they heard of this, drafted plans to further mechanize agriculture, to revolutionize transportation with rapid and efficient motor carriers, and to lay the ground work for what is now the second greatest industry of the country: the production and merchandising of food products. Blueprints for the supermarket were already coming off the drawing boards, all because—vitamins were discovered!

This "scientific advance" did more to dislocate man's dietary environment from his digestive capabilities than had any of his other improvements over the previous two million years.

Chapter 11

VITAMINS DISCOVERED; MAN'S DIET SUFFERS (Human Ecology Finally Fractured)

It has been pointed out that if one were able to examine a Roman kitchen at the time of Christ, then step next door and inspect an American urban kitchen of 1900, many similarities would be noted, and only a few differences. [23]

The food patterns of the urban occidental kitchens of fifty years ago need not be laboriously culled from history by those of us who can remember a half-century. Meals in those days were simple, mostly meat, bread, or potato, a cooked vegetable and a sweet.

Meat was purchased fresh, cured, salted, or canned, and not infrequently alive, for home butchering and preserving. Commonly eaten meats were beef, veal, lamb, mutton, pork, rabbit and fish. Poultry and eggs were plentiful, a brood of chickens frequently being kept in the back yard.

Sweet milk was not used a great deal, since pasteurization was uncommon with small dairy farmers, and the old-fashioned iceboxes were most inefficient in preventing spoilage. Most dairy products were consumed in the form of soured milk in cooking, cottage cheese, aged cheeses, butter and buttermilk, or yogurt, as beverages. Many of these were made by the housewife from sweet milk that had gone sour

before it could be consumed. Sweet milk was not drunk by children of school age as a rule; it was used in desserts, cooking, and on breakfast cereals.

Cereals were of the cooked variety for the most part, and were not particularly popular with the housewife, since they required several hours to prepare. Corn flakes were sold but were not widely used, for they were expensive and packaged. Ready-to-eat foods in those days were looked upon with suspicion by most housewives. Toward the end of this era two cereals—Grape Nuts and Puffed Rice—appeared in the pantries of the more prosperous. In general, bread, pies, cakes, cookies, and other such items were baked by the housewife. Fresh warm bread, slathered with fresh country butter, was as ambrosia. When three days old, it became rather dry and required trimming off the crusts. The remainder of the week, until the next baking day, bread was used for toast or reincarnated as sumptuous bread pudding. Bread in those days had to be not only baked but also sliced by the user, an unheard-of nuisance to a modern homemaker.

During the growing season fruits and some vegetables were eaten raw, but in the main were canned, or in some cases sun-dried. Some varieties, known for keeping qualities, were stored in "root cellars," and survived to varying degrees almost until spring. In my home, and those of my friends, the formal salad was unknown. Fresh garden produce was obtainable only during spring and early summer, and for the most part was grown in family plots. Tomatoes and cucumbers were sliced, doused with vinegar, and placed on the table for those wishing to help themselves. Green onions, radishes, and celery were, when available, offered as a relish. Lettuce was wilted by pouring a concoction of boiling vinegar and bacon bits over it. Juices were unknown; an orange was a special Christmas treat, and bananas were for the wealthy. But for at least nine months of each year, raw fruits or vegetables simply were not to be had.

The better restaurants served salads with meals only if specially ordered. During most of the year these were called "combination" salads and consisted of chilled, cooked vegetables and mayonnaise. With the first available fresh produce, it was called a "spring vegetable" salad.

Ice cream was available in three flavors but was expensive, dictating that most of it be made in the home, but ice was also expensive and cranking the freezer was hard work; therefore this delicacy was eaten only on very special occasions. A boy with a nickel had a choice of only four or five different candy bars, but very few boys had a nickel. Penny candies were available in greater variety. Carbonated soft drinks could be formulated at most drugstore soda fountains, but the bottled varieties were seen only at parties, baseball games, and the State Fair.

These were the food patterns during my boyhood in Iowa; to be sure, they were not greatly different from those of the Romans.

On moving to Seattle in the mid-twenties, arriving during the month of January, I recall the surprise of seeing oranges, celery, lettuce, healthy-looking apples, and some grapes in the stalls of the Farmer's Market. However, the entire green grocer needs of that city of 100,000 people were served by a marketplace not more than a block in size; today the old Farmer's Market would be hardly larger than the produce department of a single one of the hundred or more supermarkets serving the present city of half a million. In 1925 people of Seattle were eating some raw fruits and vegetables the year around, but in infinitesimal amounts compared with today. The salad was not then ubiquitous in either home or restaurant.

Discovery of the existence of vitamins caused great changes in the eating habits of Seattleites, and still more radical modifications in the diets of Iowans, New Yorkers, and others living north of the thirty-sixth parallel. This is how it all came about.

In the preceding chapter, mention was made of a mysterious illness descending upon many unsuspecting Orientals coincidentally with a greatly increased consumption of rice. This augmented use of rice in the diet followed the discovery of a method of processing (polishing) which made it more palatable, more digestible, less bulky, and less prone to spoilage.

This exotic malady, apparently limited to Asians living in the Orient, attracted the interest of a Polish-American

biochemist, one Casimir Funk. By ingenious pioneer research Funk, about 1911, found a cure for this illness in the cast-off bran from the polished rice and established it as a deficiency or nutritional disease. The malady was named "beri-beri." It could be cured rapidly and specifically by feeding rice bran, or by injecting an extract of the rice polishings. Funk considered this unknown substance contained in the rice bran to belong in a class of chemicals called *amines*, and since it appeared to be vital to health, suggested the term *vitamine*, later contracted to vitamin. In 1927, Dutch chemist Jansen isolated Funk's vitamin and named it *thiamine*. Eventually it was placed in the vitamin inventory and classified as Vitamin B₁.

It was immediately apparent to those interested in nutritional problems that, since beri-beri did not afflict the millions of people who had never tasted rice, Vitamin B₁ could not possibly be a vital principle found only in rice bran. A search for it among other nutriments found thiamine to be widely distributed in nearly all foods. The Japanese and Chinese had succumbed to beri-beri because the thiamine-deficient polished rice had crowded out nearly all other foods which did contain the vitamin.

The concept of vitamins was a thrilling and challenging discovery in medical research—a field of science which had been rather barren since Jenner's discovery of vaccination against smallpox over a century before. In rapid succession, other vitamins were discovered: Vitamin A (1913), Vitamin D (1918), Vitamin C (1919), Vitamin E (1922), Vitamin B₃ (1928), Vitamin B₅ (1930), Vitamin B₂ and K (1938), etc.

Today we know that vitamins cure nothing that is not the result of a vitamin deficiency, and that vitamin deficiencies have always been rare indeed, except in a few instances such as alcoholism, food fadism, starvation, abnormalities of absorption, or chronic illness with loss of appetite. However, the early nutritionists knew little about vitamin potentials or limitations. Only apparent was the fact that here were a number of remarkably powerful substances, an appropriate pinch of which would snatch a patient succumbing to beri-beri, scurvy, or pellagra from the graveside, and in a few days restore him to health and vigor. These were truly won-

der drugs, almost magical in their ability to heal and restore health.

Perhaps, mused the nutritionist, a lack of vitamins causes us to grow old, or hardens our arteries, or allows our hair and teeth to fall out. Perhaps an increased intake of these vitamins would prevent cancer and many other diseases beside beri-beri, scurvy, and pellagra. Was it possible that Ponce de Leon's fountain of youth could be as simple as a chemical mixture of vitamins?

It appeared reasonable to all concerned that increased vitamin intake would be of great benefit to mankind.

There was, however, one difficulty. In the mid-twenties, one could not go to the drug store and buy a bottle of high potency multi-vitamins. At that time the only vitamin preparation to be found on the druggist's shelves was cod liver oil. Synthesis and commercial production of vitamins lagged far behind their discovery and chemical identification. Concentrated preparations of vitamins were fantastically valuable and were to be found only in the research laboratories. It was not until World War II that the first preparations of four different vitamins in a single capsule were offered for sale. These early capsules were lacking in some as yet undiscovered vitamins, not always of standard potency, and entirely too expensive to take just for fun.

It had been noted that if a carrot, for instance, was boiled, a significant amount of its Vitamin A seemed to be destroyed. Soon it was found that many of the other vitamins were heat-labile, that is, they were destroyed or reduced in potency by heating. An excellent answer to the lack of commercially available, cheap vitamins appeared to be: eat your fruits and vegetables raw.

At this point much of the digestive difficulties with which we are beset today would have been avoided, had someone stopped to examine three questions:

1. Can man actually digest, without difficulty, a much greater and more constant intake of raw fruits and vegetables than he had ever attempted in the past?
2. Does man actually succeed in absorbing more vitamins from raw plant material than from cooked?

3. Would human health actually be improved if vitamin intake could be increased past the level supplied by conventional diets of the time?

Had these questions been examined critically, a great skepticism would have answered the first, for the material presented in Chapters 4 and 6 of this book would have been appreciated.

The answer to the first would have pointed out the answer to the second—that the laboratory animals then used to measure the absorption of vitamins from raw vegetable foods (the guinea pig, rabbit, rat, chicken), being herbivorous, were unsuitable to measure how a carnivorous animal (man) could absorb these same vitamins from foods he is unable to digest.

Had someone used the dog, cat, or even man, he would have discovered then, as was later shown in 1941, [67-1] that man absorbs only 1% of the Vitamin A from raw carrots, but 19% when they are cooked. This result is due to the fact that much of the raw carrot passes through the human alimentary tract undigested, carrying to the outside its contained Vitamin A. It would have been suspected that man would absorb less, rather than more vitamins by eating his fruits and vegetables raw.

The answer to question three would have followed critical observation of a population receiving vitamin supplements, noting that their hair and teeth continued to drop out, that they aged along with their contemporaries who were not vitamin enriched, that they still succumbed to the same colds, infections, and illnesses, and continued to die at their allotted time. They would have determined that vitamins cured nothing but illnesses caused by vitamin deficiency, and that eating high-potency vitamins was futile in creating a super-saturated vitamin state, just as it is impossible to further fill a bucket already overflowing.

But nobody bothered to ask, let alone answer these questions. Something like the following happened.

It was 1920, a snowy February day in New York, Chicago, Omaha, or Spokane. The door of a neighborhood grocery opened, tripping a tinkling bell. The proprietor, who

had been going over stock with a traveling wholesale grocery salesman, looked up. His customer, a youngish matron, stamped snow from her feet, looked hopefully about the tiers of canned goods, the case of bakery products, the bins of flour and staple goods, finally allowing her gaze to rest, less enthusiastically, on a basket of well-sprouted potatoes, a small heap of wizened carrots, and several tired-looking apples, whose large brown, moldy spots seemed to grow in size as she watched them.

"I want some tomatoes," she announced, "fresh tomatoes!"

The grocer stared in astonishment, finally feebly repeating, "Tomatoes—tomatoes in New York—in *February*?"

"Yes," she reiterated firmly, "fresh tomatoes. My copy of *Nutrition Newsweek* has just arrived, and it says my children should have fresh tomatoes to prevent getting low on Vitamin C. You know," she continued patronizingly, "this is the season for vitamin deficiencies, and when one gets low on Vitamin C... This is the fifth store that has no tomatoes."

Warned by her flashing eyes, the grocer reconsidered a retort of "You some kind of a nut?" Instead he mumbled something about "coming back in June."

The bell jingled in protest as she flounced indignantly from the store. The grocer returned to his shelves and the salesman drew on his gloves preparatory to leaving, mentally filing away for future telling the interesting story of a queer woman who prattled on about Vitamin C and wanted tomatoes, fresh tomatoes, in New York, in February.

The salesman worked his way south along the eastern seaboard, arriving two weeks later in Florida. Again he was engaged in compiling an order for staple provisions with a grocer when an overalled farmer entered. The door's tinkling bell did not sound off, since the double front doors were already standing wide open to the balmy weather.

"Want ta buy some nice tamay'tas?" queried the farmer.

"Tomatoes? Who wants tomatoes?" replied the grocer, waving his hand toward a counter piled high with the prime, dark red vegetable.

"Gotta whole truck full of 'em outside. Letcha have 'em all for twenty bucks," wheedled the farmer.

"Look, couple of days I'll be selling my own tomatoes for hog feed. Try down the road at the hog farm, he'll give you something for them," advised the grocer.

The farmer turned toward the door.

"Too bad you don't have that truckload of fresh tomatoes in New York," observed the salesman. "You could sell 'em for a dollar a pound." He again turned to his order pad, completely unaware that he had just lit the fire under what was soon to become one of the greatest industries in the country.

This farmer was greatly impressed with the salesman's chance remark. He turned over in his mind the possibility of getting his truckload of tomatoes all the way to New York. He had a good and serviceable truck. A couple of tarps and an oil heater or two should keep them from freezing. Cold weather would also keep them from spoiling. His boy could go along to stoke the heaters.

That evening he studied road maps carefully. It would be rough, to be sure, but not impossible. The following evening he and his boy were en route to New York City. Days later they arrived, dog-tired, red-eyed, but triumphant. They possessed over a ton of fresh, prime, dark-red tomatoes in the city of New York, in February.

They set up business along a heavily-traveled street of the city. People passing stared in disbelief at the crudely lettered placard down the street from a parked truck, which proclaimed, "FRESH TAMAY'TAS—\$1 per pound." They stopped, looked and bought. The farmer returned home with \$2,000 for that which he would gladly have sold for one percent of that amount.

Possibly there was considerable of the Aryan in this farmer's ancestry, for he really disliked digging in the dirt, spraying bugs, hoeing weeds, watering, and fertilizing. He would much rather buy tomatoes from his neighbors for a cent a pound, and truck them to northern markets for ninety-nine cents a pound. His son-in-law joined him with a second truck and began transporting fresh produce to St. Louis and Chicago.

The rest is history—this humble beginning of the trucking industry. It stimulated the automotive industry to build bigger, better, faster trucks with all-weather cabs, insulated

bodies, and pneumatic tires. The trucks demanded new, faster, straighter highways. Fresh produce from the southern truck farms began to reach northern markets at predictable intervals. More acres were plowed and planted in winter crops to fill the greedy trucks. Wives and mothers were happily busy the year round planning "balanced meals," and stuffing vitamin-rich carrot curls and celery sticks into husband and moppet alike. Trains got into the act with the rapid transport of perishables; later the airplane began to carry exotic delicacies from half-way around the globe, and these too soon became indispensable for good nutrition.

In northern cities summer produce markets, instead of standing in frigid, ice-coated desolation during the winter, were glassed in and heated, for now they had something to sell all year around.

From border to border, the all-season salad became a social—if not a nutritional—obligation, which accounted for the annual consumption of three million tons of lettuce and almost as many tomatoes. Raw cabbage, fruits, and other shredded raw vegetables joined the cast of characters in the salad drama, which reached its zenith with a production called the "Caesar" salad. This was a special gastric atrocity, since it managed to combine the most indigestible of raw vegetables with the only animal protein which is indigestible when raw, the egg. In addition it was designed to constitute the entire meal. A smidgen of meat, egg, or sea food was often buried beneath a deluge of greenery and considered by young marrieds to be a complete repast. All of this culinary diddling with man's diet accomplished not only more indigestion, but also the doubtful reputation that Americans ate more salads than did any other nationality.

California had more oranges than tomatoes, and it was soon found that they also contained Vitamin C. It was suspected by Californians that the Vitamin C of oranges was more specific in preventing deficiencies than was that of the tomato, and on the strength of this assumption neophyte orchardists plowed up front lawns, in addition to their back yards, for the additional citrus plantings that would be necessary to supply the demand when this idea became more widely disseminated. The fact that nobody had ever proved

that Vitamin C was worth a whit in cure or prevention of any illness but scurvy did not dim the glitter of billboard artistry, depicting a frosty glass of gold liquid with the provocative caption: "Had your Vitamin C yet today?"

The tomato people countered by putting tomato juice in cans so that several tomatoes could be swallowed at once. The citrus industry replied by putting their product also in cans. Both industries apparently forgot that the reason for fresh tomatoes and oranges in the first place was to avoid the loss of vitamins by canning.

Business was good for all hands, and business realized that the best way to keep it that way was to convince the populace that they were merchandising something without which people would be unhealthy.

The size of advertising budgets attracted geniuses,* one of whom created the slogan: "One never outgrows his need for milk," while another came up with the idea that if one wants to have the energy of children, then one must drink milk as children do. Both are astonishingly sterile bits of logic which nevertheless sold a lot of fresh milk, changing that commodity from a liability to an asset of the dairy business.

The cereal people went to considerable trouble to obtain evidence of a sort that breakfast was the most important meal of the day and that a morning meal of milk, sugar, orange juice, and cereal was apparently not inferior to bacon and eggs (although considerably more indigestible). They worked diligently on eye, ear, and taste appeal, testimonials, and instant preparation. The result: a bewildering variety of multi-hued and shaped boxes in the supermarket which have virtually crowded animal protein from the breakfast table.

The sugar industry applied a double twist to the biochemistry of carbohydrate metabolism, and people began thinking of sugar in terms of energy, believing that without sugar in the diet, energy drained away and one ran out of steam. Soft-drink tycoons added a fillip to this propaganda and gave birth to "the pause that refreshes." Pop became a

* 1969 billings for (only) the top ten advertising agencies amounted to a staggering 3,326.9 million dollars. [105-2]

national institution and soon grew to a world commodity. Food stores everywhere are now piled high with handy cartons of this carbonated sugar water; refrigerated dispensers are seen on many street corners and in most gasoline service stations. What a sly and contemptible crime this is against the underprivileged children of the world, that they are encouraged to spend their precious coins for these empty calories instead of a portion of proper nourishment. The only good thing about the whole business is the glowing report of profits at the annual stockholders' meeting.

Ice cream is now offered in 240 flavors and consumed in amounts exceeding 800,000,000 gallons each year. [106-7] The soft-drink and ice cream industries alone contribute heavily to an annual consumption of 10,900,000 tons of sugar in the United States. The cane fields of Hawaii and the sugar beet acres in Idaho and Utah flourish and keep the sugar mills working a night shift. . .but people still seem to get tired.

High-potency, multiple vitamin pills began rolling off the drug assembly lines in amounts that would make unnecessary all of the foregoing industry, but these were considered merely as supplementary insurance to the diet, and incapable of replacing the vitamins found naturally in fresh foods. Unaccountably, people continued to have the average number of colds and other illnesses, cancer still defied any cure, and people still got old after the age of sixty.

The supermarkets continued to spring up and the neighborhood grocer shriveled in the heat of competition.

A new medical term appeared—the overfed child.

People began letting out their belts a notch or two, parents considering this to be an inevitable middle-age spread in themselves. In their children it was just especially good nutrition. Many people, especially those falling under the baleful influence of a rising tide of nervousness throughout the country, began to belch and bloat, suffer abdominal cramps, heartburn, and other peculiar symptoms. Their doctor found no disease and the patient was resigned to merely having a weak stomach or, more often, he began to search for a new physician.

No one suspected these vague and inexplicable symp-

toms as being the result of the topsy-turvy diet modern man had fallen into the habit of eating, because the Department of Agriculture had published and broadcast far and near what is called the "Basic 7" of nutrition. According to this governmental bureau, in order to guarantee adequate nutrition, one must eat some food from each of the following groups. In addition, one could eat anything else he desired!

1. green and yellow vegetables, some raw, some cooked, frozen or canned.
2. oranges, tomato, grapefruit, or raw cabbage, or salad greens.
3. potato and other vegetables or fruit; raw, dried, cooked, frozen, or canned.
4. milk and milk products, fluid, evaporated, dried milk or cheese.
5. meat, poultry, fish, eggs, or dried beans, peas, nuts, or peanut butter.
6. bread, flour and cereals, natural, or whole-grain, enriched.
7. butter or fortified margarine with added Vitamin A.

One is startled to examine this list objectively and wonder how it was possible that Paleolithic man survived for a million years eating only a small part of Group 5 above.

The next chapter will describe a number of Stone Age cultures persisting today, some of whom subsist on Group 4 alone, others solely on Group 5, and still others who have never even heard of any foods belongings to Groups 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7. These Stone Age folk of the last century have survived and continue to survive in excellent nutritional balance, having been ignorant of the edict of the "Basic 7" for thousands of years.

Chapter 12

SOME MODERN STONE AGE CULTURES

Since, according to Professor Leaky, [88-2] Africa was the birthplace of man, it might be expected that there he made his most rapid strides toward civilization. Such, however, is not the case, for this continent presents today more instances of primitive folk contentedly pursuing a leisurely Mesolithic culture than does any other.

It should be recalled that the Mesolithic Age was a short period of about ten thousand years or less which lay between the Old and New Stone Ages. It was during this period that man prepared for a change in his cultural economy, from hunting-fishing-gathering to agriculture. Mesolithic foods were principally animal protein from both game and domestic sources, together with fish, fowl, dairy products, and also some vegetable materials gathered from the countryside. There was only sporadic and minimal efforts at crop production. The nomadic peoples and cattle-breeding tribes are included in the Mesolithic level of cultural development.

One of the most primitive surviving Stone Age cultures is that of the Masarwa Bushmen, nomadic dwellers of the South African Kalahari Desert, [23] [51] [88-1] who subsist by hunting and eating almost anything that moves through the barren scrub of their habitat. Without possessions or fixed abode they continually move about, make no effort to

ward cultivation of plants or domestication of animals, and in every sense are Old Stone Age in their degree of development. [38] In eastern Africa, south and west of the Sudd swamps, are the Nubia tribes, [2] primarily agriculturists, but almost surrounded by nomads, pastoral peoples and cattle breeders. Of the last, best known are the Masai of Kenya, [88-1] living today in the approximate area where Leaky found his sensational anthropological treasure, *zinjanthropus*.

The Masai are described as fierce in their conduct toward other tribes, but with firm family ties and equally strong feelings of affection for their cattle. While the Masai eat meat from game animals at times, they never slaughter their domestic animals but do manage to subsist from their bodies by periodically bleeding them. The blood thus obtained, when mixed with milk and urine and allowed to ferment, becomes the principal food of the tribe. Novel though this method of devouring the animal without ever consuming it may seem, a precedent had already been set by the Asiatic horsemen of Genghis Khan, who carried with them hollow tubes (trochars) for securing blood from the neck veins of their steeds when other food was scarce.

The Watusi are another pastoral tribe who looked down upon the agricultural peoples, [88-1] conquered them, but disdained their cultivated plants for food.

The forest pygmies, such as the Bambuti, [88-1] enjoy a slightly higher standard of living than do the Bushmen. They are nomadic, traveling about in small bands and leaving behind most of their possessions when they move. The commonest reason for shifting is the intolerable filth that accumulates at the camp site. These tiny men attack any animal with spear, bow and arrow (often tipped with poison), knives, and a remarkable lack of fear. An eighty-five-pound pygmy has been known to kill, single-handed, a two-ton elephant by deftly severing a major artery in the groin, then following it until it bled to death. Group activities in hunting large animals utilize nets and deadfalls. Gathering by the women and children brings into camp a variety of plants such as mushrooms and edible nuts and fruits in season. Grubs, termites, and certain insects are collected and eaten

with great relish. Many years ago the Bambuti were introduced to agriculture and an enlightened way of life, which they promptly abandoned, finding hunting and fishing more fun than farming, and wandering about less nerve-wracking than having possessions. The Bambuti live in peaceful coexistence with their neighbors, the agricultural Bantu, because the latter possess nothing desired by them in the way of tools, foods, or culture.

Inhabiting Somaliland, a strip of coast somewhat to the north of the Masai, is a group of nomadic camel herdsmen whose way of life has not changed perceptibly for many centuries. [65-1] The bulk of their diet consists of camel's milk, of which they drink over a gallon each day. These rugged pastoralists mingle with neighboring agriculturists but carefully avoid any semblance of agricultural activity or domestication of animals, other than their camels. Plant materials are not used in their diet to a significant degree.

In the northwestern regions of Africa the Berbers, actually early Neolithic rather than Paleolithic in their culture, practice "hoe farming" and domesticate sheep and cattle. [40] They are descendants of the folk migrating from the Middle East as early as 7000 B.C., possibly descendants of the early occupants of Fayum. They raise wheat and barley in irrigated fields which are cultivated with spade and hoe, believing the plow to be an unnecessary luxury. They have no sources of power other than their own muscles. Grain is ground by hand, wool is carded and woven on rough looms, and a pottery industry sufficient for their needs is carried on. The one-time fierce and warlike Tuaregs have persisted in their Old Stone Age culture as breeders of camels.

The Marsh Arabs of Mesopotamia took up residence in their inhospitable region of the lower Tigris and Euphrates rivers some five thousand years ago, having migrated from Persia and Anatolia. [46] [88-4] Today their culture has been changed but little by the modern world adjacent on all sides. The only domestic animals are the water buffalo, chickens, and a few sheep. Wild food animals include ducks, geese, ibis, and numerous other water fowl and predatory birds. Fish, which are abundant in everybody's front yard, form a large part of the diet. Giant wild boars roam through grain

fields of rice, wheat, corn, or barley. While taboo as a food, these fierce and aggressive animals are hunted because of the damage they do to crops and fields as well as to those working in the fields. Boar hunting is considered a sport at times.

Hand-ground grain is baked into coarse unleavened bread. The buffalo is never used as food but, together with sheep, contributes dairy products such as sour milk, cheese and butter. Food is cooked over buffalo dung fires, the only safe fuel, since it gives off no sparks to ignite the tinder-dry reeds covering the entire area. Some gathering is done by the women, who collect dates, the young shoots of a certain variety of bulrushes, the stalks of another type resembling sugar cane and, during the spring, pollen of still another species, which when collected and pressed into cakes becomes a kind of sweet-meat. Split reed mats are exported and exchanged for tea, sugar, salt, kerosene, matches, cigarettes and soap.

Nomadic Bedouins inhabit the southwest desert area of Iraq and the Negev Desert of Israel. These people subsist almost entirely on soured milk from sheep, goats, camels, and donkeys. They grow some wheat and barley which is stored against the drought season and is then baked into an unleavened bread called *rarif*. The Bedouins eat little meat, eggs, vegetables, and no fish.

The Toda herdsmen of southern India raise domesticated animals but do not cultivate crops. [98-12] Other tribes, representing about 6% of India's total population, persist today, preserving many prehistoric aspects of their Stone Age culture. This persistence of primitive cultures is thought to be due to the prolific sources of food in some areas, which allow people to live in comparative ease by hunting and primitive food gathering. In other parts of India, as is well-known, overcultivation and clearing of forests has eliminated much of the natural land cover and, paradoxically, has resulted in acute food shortages. The modern Stone Age folk are supplied with abundant fish and game, fruits, berries, yams, and mushrooms in season, in most instances providing adequate subsistence by themselves. Other tribes, or castes, have domesticated cattle, sheep, and goats, which provide

valuable dairy products. The Dhangar caste possess horses and sheep. They migrate from area to area, covering as much as four hundred miles in a season. Another tribal group, the Pardhi, have a few cattle in addition and are expert in hunting birds and other small game.

A similar group, the Ainu of northern Japan, depend on hunting and fishing for sustenance, with only minimal contributions from the soil. [40] [51] They have only a single domestic animal, the dog. The Finnish Lapp is described as depending upon his reindeer for food, clothing and shelter. [51] Numerous other primitive cultures are to be found scattered over the earth who depend upon hunting and fishing with only very primitive attempts at agriculture, if indeed there is any at all. Among these are many of the South Pacific Polynesians, New Guineans, inhabitants of the Gilbert and Marshall Islands, the Camayura Indians of Brazil, and even some remote areas of North America.

Greatly resembling the Forest Pygmies of Africa are the Negritos of North Luzon in the Philippine Islands, and the Veddas of Ceylon. [88-2] Both are primitive people without agriculture, domestic animals, or clothing. Invasion of modern technologies during World War II had served to modernize some of these primitive folk, although most promptly regressed to their previous simple economies after the cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of the interlopers, their machines, and their packaged rations.

The Old Stone Age culture of the Australian aborigine has been more carefully observed and described. [51] The pre-history of these peoples began at least sixteen thousand years ago, probably much earlier, and ended with the first landing of the British in 1788, at which time the aborigine population was about 300,000, divided into five hundred tribes. Up to that time their culture was largely nomadic, dependent upon hunting, fishing, and the gathering of wild plants. They had no domestic animals, except the dog [98-8] which, it is believed, was imported to Australia by the aborigines themselves. This animal, the dingo, together with his master, were the only predatory animals on the Australian continent, and were probably responsible for the extermination of many types of marsupials, such as the Tas-

manian Devil. Today, the Australian aborigines number about seventy thousand; [40] [106-2] they live on the inland desert. They are nomadic, living off the land and rarely erecting any but the flimsiest of shelters. [38] Since Australia had no indigenous plants that could be cultivated, agriculture does not exist among the present natives, who have been described as planting nothing, yet harvesting anything that is edible. Responsibility for replenishing the food supply is divided among all members of the family or tribal group. The men hunt for kangaroo, lizards, emu, alligator, and fish, while the women gather wild plants, seeds, nuts, small reptiles, worms, grubs, snails, water lilies and honey. The boys gather smaller rodents and various bugs and insects, an average day's bag being perhaps ten pounds of these foods. (The wild yam is poisonous until it has been purified by exposure to sun and weather for three years.)

For many years following the colonization and introduction of Merino sheep into Australia in 1797, by Captain John MacArthur, the herdsmen subsisted almost entirely on mutton and some beef. With improved communications and commerce, the herdsmen have gradually adopted a more modern diet. The aborigine, however, continues to gain his subsistence exactly as did the Old Stone Age men of Europe.

Natives of the islands north of Australia subsist chiefly on fish and shellfish, certain plant roots, seasonal fruits and *taro* which, when fermented, become *poi*. [27] The Maori of New Zealand manage well, eating birds, some vegetables and fruits, and sea foods, especially lobster.

The true Paleolithic culture of several Eskimo and North Woods Indian folk of Alaska and Canada have been described by Stefansson, [24] [41] Mowatt, [28] Price, [27] Jensen, [23] and others. [51] The genealogy of these groups is obscure. Presumably they are of Mongoloid origin and reached the northern areas of America between 1500 B.C. and the time of Christ via the then existing land bridge between Alaska and Siberia. The Caribou Eskimo differs from other Eskimos in that they are inland tundra dwellers, completely dependent upon the caribou for their existence. [40] Living in virtual isolation west of Hudson Bay, these self-sufficient primitives were unknown until 1949, when the

Canadian government installed a radio station nearby. The foods of the Caribou Eskimo lack any significant source of vegetable or plant material. During a short season blueberries are gathered, and during the hunting season the contents of the caribou stomach (rumen) furnish some pre-digested vegetable nutriment, said to be rich in vitamins. Apparently, in contrast to the Alaska Eskimo, the Caribou Eskimo consumes the entire animal, even the blood. Particularly prized is the fat, rich marrow of the long bones. The surrounding lakes abound with fish, but they are eaten only when caribou meat is scarce. Cranberry leaves are gathered and dried but for smoking, not eating.

A similar tribe of Eskimos, [28] the Ihalmiut, the "People of the Deer," have identical food habits. Meat is eaten at every meal, supplemented by well-rotted duck eggs, but no vegetable material of any sort. It is not unusual for an Ihalmiut to consume fifteen pounds of meat in a single day. Again the great desire for fat, especially the delicate, fatty bone marrow, is emphasized. Other Eskimo tribes may eat dried fish, eggs, cranberries, ground nuts, and water plants. The food of the North Canadian Indian is moose and caribou exclusively during nine months of the year, while during the summer some growing plants and the tender bark and buds of trees may be consumed.

The Alaska Eskimos and those living adjacent to the sea have access to large marine animals, such as the seal and walrus, as well as to fish, game birds, caribou, and moose. Their economy differs from those preceding in that they have an abundance of fats and oils to the point where they are used freely for heat and light as well as for food. The Eskimo considers anything from the vegetable kingdom as a substitute for food, to be eaten only to avoid starvation. [23] Mr. John Simpson, Surgeon, R.N., wintered with the Point Barrow Eskimos in 1854. [7] His is one of the earliest descriptions of the Eskimo diet, noting that they avoided all vegetable foods and salt, living on fat and lean meat, which was either raw or undercooked. These folk were robust, muscular, and active, inclining to spareness rather than corpulence, although their round faces and thick clothing gave the impression of being overweight. Anthropologist John Mur-

doch [7] observed these people about 1880 and confirmed the absence of vegetable materials in the diet, except during periods of famine. About 1896 J. H. Romig, M.D. [7], observed the Bering Sea Eskimos and found them living as they had for many centuries. He describes an Eskimo meal being served to the husbands, fathers and sons by the women. The food, cooked mostly by boiling, consisted of game and fish, dried smoked salmon and other dried fish, seal, and fish oils. When cooked the meat was rather rare; during the winter much frozen meat and fish was consumed raw. The only plant substance mentioned by Dr. Romig was cranberries, which were saved for special occasions, mixed with seal meat and tallow and eaten with snow. Dr. Samuel King Hutton, [7] in describing the North Labrador Eskimos about 1902, reports their food as including flesh foods (seal, caribou, bear, fox, birds, fish, mussels, sea urchins), with vegetable foods limited to a small black water berry and the buds and shoots of willow in the spring. The Copper Eskimos of the Canadian Eastern Arctic had their first contact with the outside world when trader Joseph Bernard visited them in 1910. He observed their foods to be exclusively flesh except in time of famine, when roots and other vegetation might be eaten.

The most accurate observations of the Eskimo were those of Vilhjalmur Stefansson. [41] He describes their meals as 100% meat and fat, or fish. Meats consisted of caribou (50%), fish (30%), seal (10%), and polar bear, birds, rabbits, and eggs (10%). Each type of meat or fish was eaten almost exclusively according to season. The only plant food eaten was berries and the contents of the caribou stomach or, in instances of starvation, whatever could be found. Fish were cached in the fall under logs, allowed to decompose, and when frozen the following winter were recovered, allowed to thaw to the consistency of ice cream, and eaten. They were said, by the author, to have a taste similar to strong cheese, of which one can become quite fond. Contrary to the statements of others, Stefansson avers that the Eskimo does not eat the entire animal, nor is much of their meat eaten raw. Cooking is by boiling or roasting. He spent a total of eleven and a half years among the Eskimos, of which time about

nine years were spent on the Eskimo diet. The first year was spent on an exclusive fish diet; other periods up to nine months were on the diversified Eskimo diet of meats and fish. Among his company of explorers was one Storker Storkerson, who aggregated five years on the Eskimo diet and a dozen who subsisted from one to three years similarly. The latter group included white, Negro, Hawaiian and Samoan men.

Recent intrusions of civilization have markedly altered the Eskimo diet in some instances. Those of the Northwest Passage area have been studied as recently as 1965. [74-6] [74-7] From 10% to 25% of their food now is obtained from trading posts in exchange for furs, family allowances, pensions and government salaries. The foods thus obtained consist of flour, lard, baking powder, rolled oats, rice, biscuits, Pablum, butter, dried milk, raisins, dried fruit, sugar, bacon, beans, jams, tea, salt, and coffee. Flour and biscuits are purchased in greatest quantity. Natural foods include seal, eider ducks, char, tom cod, deer, caribou, trout, geese, loons, and ptarmigan. About 60% of the natural foods are eaten raw and 30% are boiled. White man's foods account for about 10% of that eaten. Food taken in surplus during the season is preserved by drying or rendering and storing the fat. Salt apparently is not used in preservation of meat or fish.

An interesting food of early modern times, invented by the American Indians and used by them until the turn of the century, is pemmican. This is a preserved ration consisting of dried pulverized beef, buffalo, venison, etc., and fat. According to Stefansson, Admiral Robert E. Peary, Earl Parker Hanson, and other explorers, [77-2] pemmican is a complete food, highly valued by those traveling through wilderness country who must carry their food with them. A man doing hard work requires two pounds of pemmican daily, which is equivalent to six pounds of lean meat and one pound of fat. According to Peary, a man can eat pemmican twice daily for a year and never tire of its taste. Preparation of pemmican is simple. [77-2] Strips of meat are dried, pulverized, and stuffed into a leather bag. Hot fat is then poured over it until the bag is filled. After cooling, pemmican can be stacked in piles and will remain palatable for

years with no further preservative. From the number of authentic reports of men surviving for periods of a year or more on pemmican, with no other food or vitamin supplements, it must be concluded that even such a simple food as this must be considered as a satisfactory ration for humans.

Stefansson's suggestion that pemmican be utilized during World War II in place of preserved combat and survival rations was apparently vetoed by the Pentagon as being too unsophisticated for a modern war.

Foods of many rural communities of Europe up to the last century did not differ greatly from those of the early agricultural revolution. H. G. Wells states that the nineteenth century peasants of Germany, Switzerland, and France, had about the same food patterns as four thousand years earlier. [23] The Islanders and coast dwellers of the Aegean still live on the same food as their ancestors, their economic conditions differing little from those of the Bronze Age. Archaeologists, as late as 1873, [52] could find little physical change in Egyptians when compared to those of prehistoric times. They found them preparing the same food, in the same way, and eating it with their fingers from the same utensils as did their ancestors six thousand years earlier.

Students of nutritional characteristics of many of today's societies, from the Arctic to the Antarctic, point out that rural communities tend to remain at a primitive dietetic level, subsisting primarily on cereal grains and whole grain bread, meat and animal fats, birds, dairy products, eggs, a few nuts, and fruits and vegetables in season. Industrial areas have replaced these foods with white flour, polished rice, sugar, canned goods, sweetened fruits, jams, chocolate, and vegetable fats, with a corresponding decrease in the consumption of meat, fish, fowl, animal fats, and dairy products. [27]

From the foregoing it may be seen that actual proof is available that man, anatomically and physiologically identical with ourselves, can survive with perfect nutritional adequacy, even in most unfriendly environments, on an Old Stone Age diet of animal proteins and fats, and very little else.

This is additional confirmation that the archaeological

reconstruction of man's prehistoric diet has been accurate because today, in historical times, we can actually see and study a number of instances wherein man has progressed to, but not past, the foods of Stone Age civilization.

Most important of all is the discovery that the modern industrialized diet to which we have become currently addicted, is not of long standing but represents a radical upheaval of long-established and natural nutritional concepts which has occurred with violence, and only within the last few decades.

Can man long continue this headlong rush toward capsule meals? Is he actually faring better, or even as well, nutritionally, with his modern diet? Is his digestive tract happy with the foods fashion dictates he must put into it? These questions will be answered in later chapters.

The possibility that evolutionary changes might have made man better able to cope with this present strange diet will be discussed next.

Chapter 13

WHAT HAS EVOLUTION DONE TO US RECENTLY?

The Bible tells us that man was created in 4004 B.C., but archaeology has told us that man's creation took place over the course of several million years. The archaeological evidence of his evolutionary changes over these years consists mostly of bony skeletal finds, from which much information can be inferred regarding changes in posture, brain size, muscular development, and dentition. It gives us little or no information concerning changes in most soft tissues of the body. Neither archaeology nor anthropology, for example, can tell us whether *zjinanthropus* had a heart with two chambers or four, whether his stomach had one chamber or more, if his appendix was large or small, or if he even had one at all.

Some discussion of evolutionary changes that might have occurred recently in man's digestive tract, between the time he became a farmer and the present day (a span of ten thousand years or less), is necessary to ascertain the possibility that his digestive tract could have kept pace with his change of diet, by evolving from that of a carnivorous animal to one with herbivorous ability to subsist easily, efficiently, and comfortably on unprocessed plant food, in spite of the fact that anatomical studies give no hint that such has occurred. While factual evidence on this point is admittedly

unobtainable, some knowledge of the mechanisms of evolutionary change should allow an opinion as to whether such a change would be likely.

The specific characteristics of an individual (plant or animal), are encoded within its reproductive cells by precisely formulated bodies called *genes*, which in turn form aggregates called *chromosomes*. When the male and female procreate there is a blending of the genes of each, so that the offspring is a mixture of the characteristics of both. Individuals with a "genetic code" inimicable to survival in a given environment will usually not survive to procreate. This is a process called "natural selection," which serves to weed out inappropriate genes from a population. The opposite is equally true; genes favorable to survival will eventually dominate a population. The genetic code of an individual may also be changed by spontaneous alteration of one or more genes. When this happens the change is called a mutation, and the new genetic code is passed on through succeeding generations.

There are a number of different reasons for evolutionary changes to be initiated in an animal population. [3] The most common is that of environmental change.

When an environment is unchanging, evolutionary changes are extremely slow or absent over millions of years. There is really little or no need for adaptation to a later environment, since there has been no change from the old. This extremely slow type of evolutionary change is called *bradytelic*. Examples of unchanging environments are the abyssal regions of the sea and the tropical forests. From the former we capture today lampreys and hagfish, which have not changed an iota from the fossils of their ancestors who first appeared millions of years ago. A brachiopod (*Lingula*) has remained identical to those of the early Cambrian (400,000,000 years ago); a group of fishes (*Latimeria*) are the same as their ancestors living in the Devonian. From the tropical forests we find opossums, lemurs, and some birds identical with those living in the Cretaceous Age.

In a very rapidly changing environment, evolutionary changes are similarly very rapid and are called *tachytelic*. The reason for this is the survival of only the best fitted to

live through great and sudden changes of an environment, with the result that only the genes of those best able to cope with their new environment are passed on to succeeding generations. Freshwater shores are an example of a rapidly changing environment with freezing, stagnation, desiccation, and increasing salinity in some cases, allowing survival of only the strongest specimens—a very active process of natural selection.

Changes in environment may be harmful or beneficial to any given creature, or may affect individuals within the same race in a variable manner. Such is the classic example of the effect of the Industrial Revolution [44] upon the moth population of England. In general moths were of two types, those with black wings and those with speckled wings. The former, when resting on the light-colored bark of the trees, were easily seen by the birds who preyed upon them, thus decimating their population and greatly reducing the number of black-winged individuals surviving to procreate. The speckled moths, being effectively camouflaged, survived in greater numbers. The result was a much larger population of speckled wings than black. Had this state of affairs continued the race of black wings would have eventually disappeared. However, increasing industrial smog gradually darkened the bark of tree trunks and the situation was suddenly reversed. The black wings were now protected and the speckled wings were thrust into the spotlight. Today the moth population consists mostly of black wings, with but a few of the speckled variety.

This, again, is evolution by natural selection.

Evolutionary change that occurs at an average speed is called *horotelic*, and is the type with which we are most familiar.

While extremely rapid evolutionary change (tachytelic) might result in a specific structural change in a few thousand years, horotelic, or average speed evolution, is measured by hundreds of thousands of years, and bradytelic, or slow evolution, by the millions of years.

Another factor governing the speed of evolutionary change is the size of the interbreeding population; when large, changes are slow, and when small, changes are rapid.

The latter situation is operative in animal husbandry when the breeder, by allowing only animals with certain qualities to interbreed, drastically limits the size of the interbreeding population. He thus succeeds in creating an entirely new type of animal, within the space of a relatively few years, which is characterized by most of the desirable points of both animals, and few, if any, of the undesirable. An identical process of selective breeding in plants has been responsible for the development of wheat, rye, barley, rice, corn, etc., from their ancestral wild grasses.

Both environmental change and population size effect evolutionary change by a process of selection, occurring by chance in nature but by intent in plant and animal husbandry. Geneticists have for decades deplored the unfortunate restrictions of civilization that allow the human race to breed with much less intelligence than is applied in breeding our cattle. Effective eugenics, if such were possible, could quite rapidly eradicate hereditary disease and undesirable mental and physical traits, while enhancing desirable mental and somatic attributes.

An extremely rapid evolutionary change in growing things, which reproduce themselves by sexual union, is seen when spontaneous alteration of a gene occurs (mutation). This is quite rare in nature, but it has been accomplished both accidentally and experimentally by irradiating the gonads (ovaries or testes) with X-rays. Similar changes are thought to occur following atomic radiation, or even by ultraviolet rays. There is reason to believe that a long list of drugs and chemicals, including nitrogen mustard, some antibiotics, tranquilizers, insecticides, synthetic preservatives, coloring agents, and psychedelic substances, are capable of altering the genetic code of humans.

It was in late 1967 that a proud mother first spawned a grotesque caricature of a baby, a child with fractured chromosomes induced by the use of L.S.D. [82-4] [107-7] [109-1] How many superficially normal babies born of L.S.D. users will live to procreate similarly abnormal genes in future generations can only be conjectured.

Once a mutation has occurred, it continues to be propagated in each new generation according to fixed laws of

heredity. Body changes occurring after birth are not passed on to succeeding generations. Thus, thousands of generations of circumcision among Jews has not affected in the slightest the physical character of the prepuce of a newborn Jewish boy today.

Mutant changes may be good or bad for the race, or they may begin as a hardship to be turned into an asset in time. For instance, the mutant change in an early man which caused his great toe to grow forward, rather than laterally, prevented the use of his foot for grasping. This was a disadvantage for life in the trees but, by being thus forced to a terrestrial life, man acquired one of the basic reasons for his ultimate dominance over all other animals.

Since the span of time with which we are concerned—in which evolutionary changes in digestive potential might have occurred—amounts to ten thousand years or less, some idea of the speed with which such changes might occur would be of interest. Professor Zeuner is quoted as believing that on paleontological evidence the time normally required for the evolution of a mammalian species to be 500,000 years. [3] It is believed that by the time agriculture was introduced, man had already evolved to his present physical shape, and very likely also to his present physiological form and function. [60-1] Professor Yudkin states [76-3] that ten thousand years (three to four hundred generations) is far too short to allow adaptive changes in man from his earlier diet. Stefansson also thinks that the agricultural stage of man's existence is too brief to have allowed digestive adaptation to occur. Dr. Raymond Shatin states that man emerged as a distinct species about a million years ago and has changed very little biologically since then. [92-1] Dr. Lloyd Jensen [23] says that although man's cultural differences are great indeed, his somatic (body) changes have not been great during the past twenty-four thousand years. Neanderthal man, in modern clothing, would have passed easily for a professional football player; Cro-Magnon man, powerful, with a narrow head and fine features, could pass for modern man. Professor Schmerling is quoted as saying that a human type can be reproduced for many generations and over a very long time and still remain unchanged. [52] The man who lived in

Belgium with the extinct animals of the Pleistocene period was reproduced in the Neolithic period and still abounds in modern times.

Evolution among other animals throws some light on the speed of evolutionary changes. [12] Eohippus, an animal about the size of a fox, lived fifty million years ago and was the ancestor of the horse. The horse in its modern form had developed by the time of the Ice Age (500,000 years ago) and had changed but little since then, until the interference of modern breeding developed specific types. The horse is a product of the grasslands and grass has always been its natural food. During the post-glacial spread of the forests and their dominance over the grasslands, the horse became quite scarce. It appeared as a domestic animal in Persia in about 1800 B.C., still a grass-eater. Thus, for perhaps a half-million years, through dietary prosperity and adversity, the horse did not become adapted to a different diet and presumably did not change its digestive tract anatomy.

Another mammal with a fascinating evolutionary history, recently much publicized, is the dolphin. [5] By the Eocene period, (sixty million years ago) herbivorous animals had been evolved, [88-4] adapting to their diet by developing a special stomach of four chambers, as already described. Certain of these resembled the elephant: ponderous, slow-moving, with tremendous food requirements, who found locomotion on dry land most difficult. As a consequence they began to spend more and more time in the sea, where the water helped greatly to support their unwieldy bodies. These animals, called *Cetaceans* today, include the whales as well as the porpoises and dolphins. They doubtless slowly shifted from their herbivorous diet to that found more plentifully in the sea—fish and marine animals. Today they are entirely carnivorous. Here, then, is an animal beginning with a digestive tract similar to that of the ox, who became a carnivore. Today, twenty-five million years later, the dolphin is described as still having four chambers to its stomach, [15] but more careful observation shows that its present digestive tract resembles the carnivore more than the herbivore. [34] The first stomach of the dolphin does not possess the vital function, nor does it resemble the rumen of

the ox. Instead it is merely a dilatation of the lower end of the esophagus, not much more impressive than a similar enlargement, called the phrenic ampulla, frequently seen in man's esophagus. The second stomach, instead of being the reticulum of questionable function in the ox, is the all-important glandular stomach of the dolphin. The third and fourth stomachs of the dolphin, instead of corresponding to the functioning omassum and the glandular abomassum of the ox, are merely a folding of the distal end of the stomach with the beginning of the small intestine, not greatly different from the antrum and duodenum of the carnivorous animal. The pancreatic duct and common bile duct enter this so-called fourth stomach of the dolphin, furthering its resemblance to the carnivorous duodenum.

If this dissertation on the dolphin's stomach does not thrill you with its obvious erudition, be not dismayed. It is really only necessary for you to recognize that if—and we have no way of knowing this for certain—the dolphin began its mammalian existence with the four-chambered stomach of the ox, a carnivorous diet has resulted in evolutionary changes to the point where it resembles the carnivorous stomach more than the herbivorous, but it has taken twenty-five million years to accomplish this metamorphosis, which still remains far from completion. Thus, by inference, we might presume that an equal length of time (not a mere ten thousand years) would be necessary to effect an opposite conversion in man; that is, from carnivorous to herbivorous digestive function.

If it is assumed that all birds descended from a common prototype, there occurred somewhere along the line of species a differentiation, a marked change in the digestive tract based on a change in diet. Today carnivorous birds have a simple tubelike esophagus, while those subsisting principally on seeds and grains tend to have a markedly muscular dilatation near its lower end, that is filled with small stones and is commonly called the gizzard. This is a very ingenious built-in grain mill, which processes seeds and grains to make them digestible for the types of birds eating them. This structure is absent in carnivorous birds which do not need it. When this schism in the digestive anatomy of birds occurred

is of course unknown, but from what we know of evolutionary change in general, it is virtually certain that it occurred many hundreds of millenniums before the red hen of the Indus was first domesticated.

Carnivores had evolved from a doglike ancestor by the Eocene period (sixty million years ago). One of these, the bear, became omnivorous, and over the millions of years following made only one slight change in its carnivorous design—an enlargement of the cecum to allow it to digest the carbohydrate portion of its new diet.

In man, the stimulus for an evolutionary change in the digestive tract would have occurred only after he had begun to change his diet, less than ten thousand years ago. Any change, therefore, would have to be considered a very rapid one, relatively instantaneously!

There is no obvious reason for such a greatly accelerated tachytelic change in man. All of mankind has never been simultaneously subjected to a marked and sudden change of environment, as were the moths of England.

Since man has never seen fit to restrict breeding to certain races, cultural groups, or individuals, the inter-breeding population has always remained large.

A change in his digestive tract could not have been the result of mutation, for mutant changes are propagated only by bisexual reproduction. In order for such a change to be universally present today, universal reproductive contact would have been mandatory. Yet, it is known that for much more than ten thousand years, large segments of humanity were isolated from each other, not only geographically and culturally, but for interbreeding as well. Therefore, if our present digestive tract had resulted from a mutant change, our anatomy would be quite different from that of today's Australian aborigine, Alaskan Eskimo, or the Bushmen of Africa, who had never intermarried with the ancestors of modern man. Such, of course, is not the case.

Man has not developed a muscular gizzard in his esophagus to help digest unprocessed cereal grain, or a multi-chambered stomach to utilize cellulose; nor has he enlarged his cecum like the bear, or shown the slightest tendency to recall his appendix to active duty.

In view of this evidence, the ten thousand years allotted for man to make anatomical and functional adaptation to an altered diet, appears to be totally insufficient to accomplish even the most minor change of the digestive tract in these respects.

Therefore, it must be concluded that man's digestive tract is still that of the carnivore, best able to digest carnivorous foods.

Chapter 14

WHY CARNIVORES MUST EAT AS CARNIVORES DO

Any mechanism, be it living tissue or mechanical contrivance, which is able to do work of any sort, requires fuel to make it perform. A machine, such as the automobile, is usually designed to consume gasoline as a fuel. A few are engineered in such a way that they can burn a much cheaper fuel, such as diesel oil. The gasoline car cannot run on diesel oil, nor can the diesel automobile perform with gasoline in its tank.

Thus we have two automobiles, similar in appearance and in the function they are to accomplish, which, however, require radically different types of fuel.

While these facts are easily understood by everyone, many people have difficulty in appreciating a parallel truth that living organisms also demand specific fuels (foods), depending upon their design. While it is recognized that cows eat grass and tigers eat meat, each according to its own design, it seems inconceivable to many people that carnivorous man cannot eat, digest, and be nourished by most any sort of food he is capable of swallowing.

While fuels supplied to most engines are highly refined or purified from their original crude state, those available to living organisms, for the most part, occur in their natural form and must be "digested" before the nourishing elements

may be freed for use by the body as food. It has already been shown that the plans of herbivorous and carnivorous digestive tracts differ markedly from each other. The former is constructed to digest plant materials, the latter meat and fat. If unprocessed plant material is placed in the carnivorous alimentary tract, it is digested only in minute amounts. The great majority of it passes through the stomach and small intestine unchanged and is emptied into the colon. Other carbohydrates, even though processed, also escape digestion to some degree and similarly reach the colon in varying amounts.

Let us see what happens to this undigested material after it reaches your large intestine.

Myriad bacteria enter your mouth and pass through the digestive tract each day. Many of these are introduced in food and liquids we drink. Others originate from the normal bacterial population of the nose and throat; while still others come from objects placed in the mouth or are simply inhaled. Most of these swallowed organisms are killed and digested by the stomach and intestinal secretions, but a few live to pass through the digestive tract and arrive in the colon. If a particular organism finds conditions in the colon favorable, it settles there and begins to raise a family. If conditions are not to its liking, the organism keeps going and passes out of the body in the feces.

It is recalled from Table I that the colon of a carnivorous animal contains putrefactive organisms, while those of herbivores are predominantly fermentative. [49] Putrefactive bacteria feed preferentially on meat and fat; the fermentative type like carbohydrate best.

Putrefactive bacteria, or proteolytic organisms, as they may be euphemistically designated, when they attack meat and fat change those substances into fatty acids, glycerine, and conglomerates of amino acids called proteoses and peptides. In other words, bacterial decomposition of meat and fat by putrefactive bacteria in the colon yields the same products as does normal digestion by the pancreatic juice. However, these bacteria, if offered simply carbohydrates, are capable of decomposing them also, but when this happens acid and gas are produced.

Fermentative organisms act only upon carbohydrates or plant food. This process is called *fermentation*.

This process of fermentation is one of the most important biological reactions in nature. It is used industrially in the manufacture of many different acids.

When fermentation takes place in your colon, the products are carbon dioxide (a gas) and alcohol. The latter is promptly fermented further to acid, such as acetic acid or vinegar.

The carnivorous animal, eating nothing but meat and fat, cannot possibly allow carbohydrates of any sort to reach its colon, for there is none of it in his diet. Therefore no food arrives there to support a fermentative colony. The proteolytic bacteria live happily on the minute amount of protein and fat which escapes carnivorous digestion and prosper, maintaining a thriving bacterial community. Since there is no carbohydrate present they cannot produce any acid, and the resulting alkaline reaction of the colon is very much to the liking of these organisms.

Civilized humans rarely eat nothing but meat and fat; there is nearly always carbohydrate of some sort in each meal, usually a large amount. This means that more or less carbohydrate escapes digestion and reaches the colon. Even small amounts of carbohydrate may support a modest fermentative community. If the amount of carbohydrate is larger, a more flourishing fermentative population develops, and if there is, in addition, a considerable proportion of highly indigestible carbohydrate in the diet, the fermentative organisms become overwhelming. The production of acid zooms and the fermenters not only multiply but also invite their cousins—the yeasts, molds, and fungi—to settle in this Promised Land of acid and carbohydrate you offer them. The latter are also efficient fermenters and, as their numbers increase, a vicious cycle is established wherein more and more of the carbohydrate escaping digestion in the small intestine is changed to acid. The colon gets more and more irritated and irritable. Diarrhea and abdominal distress appear. The irritable colon begins to send out local and long distance distress signals to the rest of the digestive tract. The stomach becomes crampy and gassy. The small intestine speeds up its

transport of food through itself and carbohydrate in the diet, difficult to digest at best, is whisked into the colon with even less digestion than before, and the amount reaching your colon is consequently increased still further. Larger and larger populations of fermenters can be supported and things go from bad to worse.

Meanwhile, the putrefactive bacteria, the good fellows, finding this acid environment not to their liking, gradually bail out, leaving the bad fellows unopposed. The patient, of course, doesn't notice them leaving—he just wonders why his rectum is itching and burning.

One might say, with all the antibiotics and wonder drugs at our disposal—why not kill off the fermentative bacterial flora and thus cut down or even abolish their acid-forming activities? Then one could gaily gobble up all manner and sorts of fodder foods and suffer no ill effects. The only thing wrong with this proposal is the fact that the putrefactive organisms are more susceptible to such drugs than are the fermenters and they succumb most rapidly. The only way to abolish the acid-producing bacteria and re-establish the putrefactive is to reverse the order of procedure that caused the imbalance in the first place. If you eat nothing but meat and fat, no carbohydrate can possibly reach your colon. The fermentative bacteria have nothing to eat and they begin to disappear. The production of acid is halted and the normal microbial flora is slowly re-established. As this takes place, diarrhea and your other symptoms of irritable colon gradually disappear.

It requires about three months of rigid dieting, however, to accomplish this restoration.

Synthetic diets [74-11] [92-6] composed of pure glucose, fatty acids, and amino acids, do not require digestion and are completely absorbed, allowing no nutritive material at all to reach the colon. Such a diet, when tested on volunteers, maintained a satisfactory nutritional state, but the bacterial population of the colon was markedly decreased to the point of practical sterilization. Such a diet, designed for use by space travelers, would be ideal in abolishing fermentative organisms from the colon and treating colitis.

Another reason that carnivores must eat as carnivores do is the fact we learned previously—that while herbivores can synthesize animal protein from plant foods, the carnivores cannot. [33] It was also pointed out that certain amino acids which are called “essential” can be obtained by the carnivore only from animal protein. Without a full complement of these specific amino acids, the carnivorous animal cannot exist. [96-14] When they are present in only suboptimal amounts, the general health of the carnivore, and man, is impaired.

Francois Magendie, [23] nineteenth century physician and physiologist, proved the truth of this statement by feeding dogs a diet restricted to “rich white bread.” His dogs died within sixty days. This was because refined wheat lacks a single one of the essential amino acids, lysine.

Carnivorous animals and man must have animal fat also to remain healthy. This has been known by frontiersmen for centuries. Stefansson, [41] and Bradford Angier, [22] describe a diarrheal disease called “rabbit starvation.” At certain seasons rabbits lose practically all the fat from their bodies. Men forced to subsist solely on these fatless rabbits quickly develop severe dysentery, which is very disabling and occasionally fatal. The disease is cured quickly by ingesting lard or any other sort of animal fat. Sir George Hubert Wilkens [50] describes similar disability in the Arctic, in the tropics, and in Australia. The illness has been caused by eating the fat-free flesh of starved horses [23] and winter-starved elk. [1] The latter illness was immediately cured by eating bear grease.

Still another reason why carnivores must eat as carnivores do is the presence of certain anti-nutritive substances in wheat and other cereals, in legumes (beans, peas, lentils, peanuts, etc.) and in a few animal proteins (uncooked egg white, blood and colostrom). [25] These anti-nutritive substances are actually *anti-protein*. [32] They work against proteins in three ways: 1) by reducing the power of trypsin, the protein-digesting enzyme of the pancreatic juice; 2) by interfering with the absorption of other proteins even though they have been adequately digested; and 3) by increasing the

need of the animal for certain amino acids.

Anti-protein substances are inactivated by heating, but not very effectively at the temperature reached in ordinary cooking. Higher temperatures or extended heat treatment may denature some of the protein or destroy certain amino acids of the vegetable protein. The temperature reached in baking rarely destroys much of the anti-protein substances in soybean or wheat flour.

While thus harmful to carnivores, these anti-protein substances are completely innocuous when ingested by ruminant herbivores, further evidence of Nature's wisdom in designing her various animals and a clear indication of the foods she intended each to consume.

When acting upon an animal protein, these anti-protein substances seem to cause decreased liberation of the essential amino acids, which degrades animal protein to the nutritional status of mere vegetable protein. In cases where animal protein intake is only marginal, the consumption of vegetable material containing an anti-protein substance might well cause a state of protein malnutrition.

The growing tendency to substitute legumes and cereals for animal proteins in equivalent amounts thus requires careful scrutiny before reliance may be placed on them as proper human nutriment.

Some patients have voiced the opinion that if they persistently ingest the most indigestible foods, they can eventually condition or develop their digestive potential so that they will be able to handle such foods with ease and comfort. This effort has about the same chance for success as would the persistent efforts of our mechanic to operate his gasoline engine on diesel oil.

To say that carnivorous animals and man get along best on a diet of nothing but animal protein and fat is the truth; to say that he *must* subsist on such a strict diet is obviously indefensible. Of course carnivores possess a limited potential for the digestion of some carbohydrate foods. It must be recognized at the same time that different carbohydrates vary greatly in the ease with which they may be digested and assimilated by the carnivorous alimentary tract. By choosing those most susceptible, and rejecting those relatively imper-

vious to carnivorous digestion, a reasonable diet for humans can be formulated. By holding total carbohydrate to a minimum we can practically eliminate acid fermentation, the cause of functional indigestion.

Chapter 15

A TWENTIETH CENTURY STONE AGE DIET

We have already seen that the diet of man has undergone a number of revolutions. Primitive man ate only meat and fat. Paleolithic (Old Stone Age) man added a few plant foods that he gathered from the countryside, while Neolithic (New Stone Age) man began to domesticate wild animals and cultivate a few simple crops. He gradually became a more talented farmer and, over the centuries, added more and more carbohydrate to his diet while maintaining an abundant supply of animal proteins. The growth of cities and industry demanded the advent of food processing and preservation, which greatly increased the amount of carbohydrates in the diet and tended to decrease the consumption of animal proteins. Then came the Age of Vitamins and nutritional sciences, and man was encouraged to partake of many strange, concentrated, processed, and unprocessed foods so he would be healthier. But for some reason he was not healthier because of his new diet, and he became more and more uncomfortable in his midriff. Today man is trembling on the brink of still another dietary revolution which will return full circle to the place where he began—to his Stone Age diet of meat and fat, with only a small amount of easily digested carbohydrate.

We can formulate this modern Stone Age diet by start-

ing with nothing but animal proteins and fats on the list. The scope of the diet can then be widened by adding other food substances, but only those which have been examined in the light of our newer knowledge and found to be suitable for carnivorous digestive capabilities. It will be necessary to ruthlessly reject any food regardless of its popularity, appetite appeal, past usage, ease of preparation or cheapness, if it does not satisfy this fundamental criterion of carnivorous digestibility.

Meats, fowl, eggs, and fish may be of any available variety and they may be cooked in any manner desired. Just where and when the antipathy for fried foods developed is unknown. Most persons are surprised to discover that a fried steak or chop is just as digestible and flavorful as when boiled, roasted, broiled or baked. Preserved meats such as bacon, ham, corned beef, or dried, smoked, or salted fish are all quite acceptable to the digestive tract, but of course should not constitute the major protein intake. Prepared meat, such as many weiners, sausages, luncheon loaves, bologna, and some ground meats have been enhanced by the addition of cereal or powdered milk. The label on the package must state that these substances have been added. If they are present, they render that particular meat product unsuitable for our diet.

Another cherished notion of the consecrated dietetic buff is the belief that white fish and the white meat of chicken are more easily digested than the colored variety. Since, so far as is known, the digestive tract possesses no color perception, it would appear that such a belief has no valid foundation.

Organ meats such as liver, kidney, brain, heart, pancreas, breast, and stomach are nutritious and prized by various cultures. Bones may be cracked to obtain the fatty marrow, and even the hide of an animal is digestible if it has not been tanned. Therefore, do not reject the nutritious skins of fish, poultry, or the pig (sow belly, "cracklins", bacon rind, etc.). It's all good food.

With the exception of cheese, animal proteins were the foundation of the human diet for hundreds of millenniums. Such durability must certify their suitability for human con-

sumption. Cheese, however, is a comparative newcomer (3000 B.C.) to the list of man's foods, being an unexpected dividend from the domestication of animals. [23] The cheeses of today are in many instances altered by the addition of sweet or powdered milk, which contains carbohydrate. These modern processed cheeses must be rejected from our diet, while the natural products, such as cheddar, Swiss, Edam, Roquefort, and most other Old World cheeses, are quite acceptable. Most cottage cheeses have been spoiled for our diet by the addition of sweet milk or cream for the purpose of making them taste like something other than cottage cheese.

Milk has been one of the foods of man since pre-history. Since refrigeration and preservation by pasteurization of sweet milk is a product of twentieth century technology, its consumption until then was limited to sour milk, yogurt, cottage cheese, or aged cheeses. The infant at its mother's breast was probably the only human to receive sweet milk in significant quantities prior to Graeco-Roman times.

The carbohydrate contained in sweet milk is a sugar called lactose. This sugar is difficult to digest by most adult humans and other carnivorous animals. If sweet milk is ingested, most of the lactose passes through the small intestine without being broken down and reaches the colon, where it comes in contact with the fermentative organisms usually present in the large intestine of moderns. Fermentation of lactose results in production of a strong acid called lactic acid. Being irritating, the lactic acid stimulates the colon to hurry its contents along more rapidly than usual; less than the normal amount of water is absorbed from its contents, and varying degrees of softening of the stool occurs, even to the point of actual diarrhea. [55-2]

When milk is "soured" by bacteria, the production of lactic acid coagulates the milk and gives it the characteristic acid or sour taste. While lactic acid, when formed in the colon by fermentation, is most irritating, this same substance formed by fermentation outside the body may be ingested without irritating the stomach in the least, for it is recalled that the stomach is habitually bathed in a much stronger acid continuously. While sweet milk and cream cannot be included in our Stone Age diet, fermented milk,

such as buttermilk, sour milk, yogurt, plain cottage cheese, and most other cheeses may be allowed.

Cooking the milk does not alter the lactose in it, and foods containing sweet milk such as soups, cream sauces, puddings, ice cream, sherbets, etc., must be avoided. It should be remembered that goat milk, skim milk, canned and powdered milk and cream also contain lactose, and therefore fall into the same category of unsuitability as does sweet cow's milk.

The only animal's milk which contains no lactose is the California sea lion, a patently inappropriate source of milk for human consumption.

An occasional adult seems able to digest sweet milk without difficulty. If such is actually the case, there is no reason for him to avoid this substance. However, before reaching such a conclusion he should carefully evaluate his digestive function, presence or absence of gas, abdominal distress or soft stools when totally abstaining from milk, as compared to its unrestricted use.

All animal fats, including butter, are easily digested by humans. The single exception to this rule probably concerns the individual with gallstones. Vegetable oils and fats are also easily digested, and olive oil, margarine, mayonnaise and various cooking oils are included in the diet. Vegetable oils should not form the majority of fats ingested. All the fat occurring in and on meat should be consumed. The proper proportion is about three parts lean meat to one part fat. Fats should constitute up to 80% of the calories in a low carbohydrate diet, as will be discussed later. It will be found that a liberal intake of fat will effectively eradicate any craving for carbohydrate foods. [77-1]

In addition to animal proteins and fats, prehistoric man gathered certain succulent plants which he ate in small amounts to supplement his diet, particularly in times of famine. Today we have a great number of such vegetables from which we can choose ten which have a low carbohydrate content. These cooked vegetables may be combined with other acceptable dietary adjuvants such as cheese, sour cream or yogurt, and vinegar, or may be cooked with bacon, ham, or other meat, as stews or casserole dishes.

Any vegetable material is digested by the carnivore only if it has been processed by cooking. This is the reason prehistoric man restricted plant foods to times of famine and even then used them sparingly, for he did not yet know how to cook and his vegetable foods were almost wholly indigestible.

It was only after the Neolithic farmer invented cooking that he turned his attention to vegetable crops, which could be made edible by boiling or other forms of cooking. From what information can be gleaned from prehistoric as well as historic times, [88-3] humans continued to eat their vegetables cooked until early Roman times, when plebeians were described as eating raw plant foods in the form of salads. Their greens included chicory, lettuce, endive and garlic. Cheese was added and various spices blended with vinegar served as dressing. Aristocratic Romans resisted the salad trend until near the close of the Roman Era, when they began eating lettuce at the end of the meal. During the Middle Ages salads virtually disappeared for a thousand years, raw vegetables being used only as a purgative. Renaissance Italy revived the salad but served it at the end of the meal. Italian salads were often composed of chilled cooked vegetables and fish. The abortive efforts of Catherine of Aragon to inflict the salad upon Englishmen has already been recounted. Salads in France, prior to 1900, consisted mostly of potato, salmon, lobster, chicken, or fruit, served with mayonnaise or heavy dressings. [88-3] It was only after transportation of fresh produce was begun during the past few decades that the modern salad appeared in France. Russians, because of the practical absence of fresh greens, concoct their "salads" from boiled beets, potatoes, string beans, pickles and celery. The status of the salad in the western United States early in this century may be deduced from a menu of the plush New Washington Hotel dated May 4, 1913. While all sorts of epicurean dishes from Dolly Varden trout to fresh strawberries and cream were offered, salads of any sort were prominently absent.

Since eating of raw vegetables is a recent innovation in man's diet; since it has failed to be universally accepted throughout the world; and since it is periodically rejected by various societies, it must be concluded that raw vegetables

are not only dispensable but are actually unsuited to the human diet. The use of raw vegetables of various sorts as laxatives [88-3] throughout history, adds authenticity to the assertion that such foods are indeed quite irritating to the digestive tract of man.

If one is so addicted to salads that their elimination causes considerable trauma to the appetite, a substitute may be manufactured from cooked, diced, and chilled vegetables from the list to be given, which, when combined with a suitable dressing, will prove acceptable to hostess and guests alike.

There are other dietary materials which have withstood the test of time and appear to be suitable for man's digestive tract. Coffee and tea (without cream or sugar) are acceptable if the individual is not suffering from peptic ulcer or certain other ailments of the stomach or esophagus. Alcohol, since it does not require digestion and is absorbed from the stomach, causes no difficulty in the colon or elsewhere in people who are not addicted to alcohol. Alcohol, if taken at all, should be as spirits (whiskey, brandy, vodka, etc.) and mixed only with water. Most mixers contain large amounts of sugar, which defeats the purpose of a low carbohydrate diet. Beer, ale, and wines also contain too much carbohydrate to be included in our diet. But remember—whiskey also contains carbohydrate calories—about sixty per ounce.

Gelatin is a pure protein, although an incomplete one. It should not be considered a "must" protein but can serve an interesting role in the diet when added to bouillon or soups, and when sweetened with non-caloric sugar substitutes, as a low carbohydrate dessert.

Prehistoric man undoubtedly ate some wild fruits from time to time. Since on this diet breakfast is a somewhat trying meal, we can afford to make it more appealing by allowing a small serving of cooked and unsweetened fruit at that meal. Here again the non-caloric sweeteners do valiant service to the dieter with a sweet tooth, although they do tend to keep alive a craving for sweets (Chapter 16). We are attempting to formulate a non-irritating diet for man's digestive tract, and therefore the naturally laxative foods such as prunes, figs, rhubarb, etc., must be excluded.

Fruits and vegetable juices, however, are in a somewhat different category. These substances are of a very recent origin, the first tomato juice being canned commercially in 1920. [108-9] Four years later 120,000 cases were marketed, and the following year consumption jumped to a staggering 1,340,000 cases. What the consumption of this one juice today might be is inestimable. When all juices, both fresh and canned, are totaled, it may be concluded that Americans today are sloshing their digestive tracts with a considerable amount of carbohydrate from this one article of diet alone. The juices differ from whole fruits and vegetables in another way. If fresh vegetable or fruit juice, prepared in a blender, is examined under a microscope, it may be seen that the individual cells are not fractured or crushed by the process. They are seen to be intact, floating about in the fluid portion of the plant material. In this form they are as indigestible as was the original raw fruit or vegetable.

It is easy to drink a glass of orange juice containing the carbohydrate from three or four oranges, or the vegetable juice from a half-dozen carrots. Ingesting plant food in the form of juices tends to greatly increase the amount of these substances which are used in the diet, and in a form that leads one to believe that he has actually taken only a very few calories.

When canned, the cells usually are disintegrated by the heat of the canning process, but juices are usually consumed as the first item of breakfast and in a cold or iced state. Under these conditions the juice leaves the empty stomach immediately and is whisked through the small intestine with extreme rapidity, much too fast to be digested, and is deposited virtually unchanged in the colon, where it is an excellent substrate for the fermentative process. Fruit juices contain a significant amount of fruit sugar and are often additionally sweetened. They must be rejected, on this score as well, as being unsuitable for the low carbohydrate diet. Canned tomato juice is the only one of the juices which is acceptable, and then only if it is consumed hot or at room temperature, and sipped in small amounts during the meal.

While juices are capable of surreptitiously loading the American diet with a great amount of carbohydrate, another

substance accomplishes this more regularly and with even more stealth. The substance is sugar.

Jollife [6] estimated that in Colonial times, sugar accounted for only twenty-five calories of the daily food intake. In 1940 sugar accounted for six to seven hundred of the daily calories per person, and it is anybody's guess what the figure would be today. [106-7] This number of calories—600 to 700—represents between five-and-a-half and six ounces of granulated sugar, the amount secured from two-and-a-half to three pounds of sugar beets. [57-2] It would of course be impossible for a person to eat this amount of sugar beets in addition to his regular diet. This is how sugar packs great amounts of carbohydrate into the diet without the eater being at all aware of it. Figures relating to the per capita consumption of this material are often meaningless, for they do not specify whether sugar consumed as candy, soft drinks, bakery goods, ice cream, canned fruit, syrups, lactose, honey, and other sugars are included. For example, in 1930 the per capita consumption of sugar in the United States was said to be 102 pounds per year, yet the total consumption of sweets, including candy, corn sugar and syrups, excluding honey, was almost 140 pounds per person. In 1966 United States Citizens consumed ten million tons of sugar. [106-7] Similar consumption figures hold true for England, where the per capita consumption of sugar in 1966 was 120 pounds. A continuing trend toward the increased use of sugar is demonstrated by the fact that high starch foods have decreased from 62 to 42%, while the use of sugars and syrups has increased from 22 to 35%. [93-3]

In most civilized countries the use of sugar began to be considered indispensable only since the beginning of the twentieth century. It therefore must be considered that this food, of very recent origin in the history of man's diet, is one which he can get along without, to his great advantage.

If we summarize our thinking at this point, a reasonable low carbohydrate diet may be formulated as presented in LOW CARBOHYDRATE DIET "A."

This is a very strict diet, one which should be used by individuals suffering from functional digestive distress such as gas and flatulence, irritable colon, chronic diarrhea, co-

litis, and acid indigestion. The patient is not expected to place such a diagnosis upon himself. He should consult his physician, and only after reassurance that such is the proper diagnosis can he begin the low carbohydrate diet with safety and any expectation of benefits.

If the low carbohydrate diet is to be used only for obesity by the patient who has quite normal digestive function on a general American diet, he may with impunity add other low carbohydrate vegetables eaten in the raw state. Such a diet is presented as **LOW CARBOHYDRATE DIET "B."** Alcohol, however, must be avoided because of its carbohydrate content.

Patients who have embarked on the strict low carbohydrate diet (Diet "A") for the treatment of functional digestive distress, should continue until all symptoms of distress have disappeared. As a rule this will be accomplished about the time the fermentative flora of the colon have been eradicated, usually a period of about three months. It will be possible at that time to add to the diet certain other carbohydrate foods, provided they are easily digested (**LOW CARBOHYDRATE DIET "C"**).

If we turn again to man's experience with diet in the prehistoric era for guidance, we must go back to the period at about 5000 B.C., at which time he had perfected strains of wheat and other grains, which yielded a sufficient crop to justify addition of these foods to his diet. In addition he had learned that grinding the grain, mixing it with water and leavening, and baking it, greatly enhanced its digestibility. From that time on man seemed perfectly happy with this addition to his diet, and has never felt the need to curtail the use of cereal grains. A parallel development of rice in China achieved equal popularity and permanence in the diet. Somewhat later, in the New World, primitive farmers concentrated on a wild succulent tuber—the potato—and soon it became an indispensable part of the diet in that area. In post-Columbian times it was exported to the Old World where it was soon enthusiastically accepted, especially in such areas as Ireland. Its use has been so widespread and its flesh, when properly baked or boiled, is so easily digested by

the human, that it has become a staple source of carbohydrate along with wheat and rice.

The first advance in the diet of patients with functional digestive distress from DIET "A," will be the addition of wheat, rice, and potato to the diet.

Wheat at the present time, in addition to bread, is present in the form of cakes, pastries, breakfast cereals, macaroni, spaghetti, snack foods, and hundreds of other forms. With the exception of bread and hard rolls, wheat today is mixed with milk, sugars, highly spiced sauces, syrups, jellies and jams, etc.—all of which add greatly to its carbohydrate content or make it indigestible, thus spoiling it for inclusion in the diet. As a consequence wheat will be allowed primarily only as bread or hard roll, and in restricted quantities. Bread should be toasted not to increase its digestibility, but because it seems to go further in that form. It does not matter if the bread be white, whole wheat, rye, or even pumpernickel. It may be spread liberally with butter or margarine.

Through the centuries rice has been found to be easily digested without grinding and with mere boiling. It is in this form that it can be added to the diet where it may be incorporated in soups, casseroles, or as pilaf.

Potatoes should be boiled, mashed, or baked, with butter, sour cream, and bacon after the Continental style.

Addition of this much carbohydrate to the diet should be well-tolerated and should stop any further weight loss. Patients who have reached their goal of weight loss or relief from functional digestive distress, after several months of dieting, should remain on the basic low carbohydrate diet, plus the additions from Diet "B" or Diet "C," as indicated, indefinitely. They should stray from the diet only on special occasions, then return on a strict basis for several days. This is a most difficult thing to accomplish, for even minor lapses from the diet reawaken dormant hungers and appetites.

LOW CARBOHYDRATE DIET "A"

SOUPS

Clear soups, consommé, bouillon. Cream soups made of vegetable puree from the following list, in a mixture of sour cream (one part) and water (two parts). Gelatin may be added for jellied soups.

VEGETABLES:

Must be cooked or canned. Vegetables need not be puréed.

carrots stringbeans asparagus tomatoes zucchini
beet greens celery spinach mushrooms eggplant.

MEAT:

Any variety except prepared meat containing flour, cereal, or milk solids. Meats may be cooked in any way desired.

FISH:

Any kind including shell fish, but no dressing except mayonnaise.

CHEESE:

Any sort except cottage cheese with added sweet milk or cream. Avoid cream cheese or processed cheeses containing milk solids (powdered milk).

EGGS:

Cooked in any fashion desired. Do not add milk or cream in cooking.

SALADS:

If made only with cheese, plain cottage cheese, gelatin, cooked fruits, with mayonnaise or vinegar and oil dressing. Combination salad of cooked, diced vegetables from list above, chilled and served with mayonnaise or oil and vinegar.

FRUITS:

Include only peaches, pears, apricots, and apples. Must be cooked and unsweetened, avoiding the juice. Only one serving of fruit daily, including that in salads or gelatin.

JUICES:

No vegetable or fruit juices are allowed, except warm or hot tomato juice sipped during the meal.

DRINKS:

Coffee (black without sugar), tea, Postum, Sanka (brewed), yogurt, buttermilk, spirits. Avoid beer, ale and wines, sweet milk, soft drinks, and instant coffee containing lactose.

DESSERTS:

Cooked fruit, cheese (no crackers). No ice cream or sherbet.

MISCELLANEOUS:

Olive oil, plain unflavored gelatin, salt, vitamins, butter.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES:

1. Strictly avoid any food not appearing on the above list.
2. Avoid foods to which you are known to be allergic.
3. Size of portions is unlimited, except for cooked fruits (see below).
4. Moderate use of salt and pepper is usually well-tolerated.
5. Weight loss is expected and need cause no concern.
6. Eat all fat in or on meat.

LOW CARBOHYDRATE DIET "B" (For Obesity only)

Include all foods in Diet "A" plus the following foods, to be eaten raw or cooked as desired:

lettuce celery tomatoes radishes watercress endive cauliflower
broccoli onions cucumbers cabbage romaine

LOW CARBOHYDRATE DIET "C"

Include all foods listed in Diet "A" plus one of the following foods:

One slice of toast or hard roll, once daily

One cup cooked rice once daily

One small potato, baked or boiled, once daily

One cup (cooked) macaroni or spaghetti with cheese may be substituted for any of the above.

The carbohydrate content of each of the three meals should be approximately equal.

HELPFUL HINTS FOR IRRESOLUTE DIETERS

1. There is no such thing as a part-time dieter. The successful one must be imbued with the crusader's zeal, the single-mindedness of a martyr and a "do or die" resolve.
2. If you have the courage, the best possible beginning for your diet would be a twenty-four-hour fast! During this time nothing but coffee, tea and other non-caloric liquids are taken. After such a fast you will eagerly anticipate foods which formerly had only dubious pleasure values to you.
3. Do not allow yourself to dream of forbidden foods or dwell on your knowledge that ice cream is in the refrigerator or cookies are in the pantry. Eat a piece of cheese and read a few pages. Get out of the habit of eating for pleasure and begin eating from hunger.

ESPECIALLY FOR THE CORPULENT

4. The twenty-four-(or better yet, a forty-eight-) hour fast will allow your stomach to "shrink" so that very small portions of food will satisfy your hunger. At the very first feeling of fullness, stop eating. Your hunger has been satisfied and further food will be taken purely for pleasure.
5. Be a *dainty* eater. Take small bites. Lay down the fork after each bite. Chew slowly and swallow before again picking it up. Converse between bites or read a few sentences of something. It is amazing how such a technique of eating will produce satiety after only a small amount of food.
6. By being a slow eater most others at the table will have finished, so that food left on your plate will go unnoticed.

7. When eating out, always select the entree you like the least.
8. At each meal demonstrate mastery of your appetite by leaving some food on your plate.
9. Do not fill up on liquids with meals. This causes a rapid emptying of the stomach and an early return of hunger.
10. Remember: alcohol not only contains carbohydrate and slows your weight loss, but also decreases will power and the resolve to adhere steadfastly to your goal.
11. While weight loss is possible without restricting the amount of food eaten, results will be more dramatic if the foregoing suggestions are accepted and moderate caloric intake is allowed to become a habit.
12. Study and understand the next chapter on hunger and appetite. Understand thoroughly why a bite or two of forbidden food *never* satisfies a craving for it but almost invariably triggers a "food binge."
13. For this reason artificially sweetened foods are a double-edged sword for, while they themselves add little if any nourishment, they will keep alive a craving for sugar-sweetened foods with their load of carbohydrate calories.

Chapter 16

HUNGER AND APPETITE

It has been said that because of hunger we have restaurants, but because of appetite the restaurant has a menu. This is indeed a cogent statement, for a hungry man will swallow anything to alleviate the pangs of hunger; [22] [26] the man who must search the menu before ordering is merely deciding which offering will be most titillative to his taste buds. It is doubtful if more than a small percentage of moderns have experienced true hunger very often.

Even though both are related to the process of eating, hunger and appetite bear not the slightest resemblance to each other.

Hunger is innate, an inborn or unconditioned reflex; appetite is acquired, a conditioned reflex.

The newborn infant need not be taught that he is hungry, nor does the adult necessarily become hungry precisely at seven, twelve, and six o'clock. Hunger is a sensation of discomfort that comes on a certain length of time after the stomach becomes empty. University of Chicago physiologist Anton J. Carlson, first showed hunger to be caused by a series of strong contractions of the stomach. No matter how long since the preceding meal, hunger is not perceived if these contractions are not present. Placing a small amount of food, or even inert material with no food value at all, in the stomach, immediately causes the hunger contractions to

cease and the sensation of hunger to vanish. After the stomach has emptied and enjoyed a period of interdigestive rest the hunger pangs reappear, gently at first and gradually growing stronger, until something again is placed in the stomach. If the hunger contractions are ignored, it is found that after twenty-four hours they begin to be less forceful and finally disappear altogether. This explains why, during a fast of several days, hunger is experienced only during the first day or two without food.

Certain circumstances may affect hunger contractions. If they are increased, as by certain inflammatory lesions of the stomach, the contractions are more frequent and vigorous, giving rise to the well-known hunger pains described by peptic ulcer patients. If hunger contractions are decreased by nausea, discomfort, exhaustion, or emotional upset, the onset of hunger may be delayed long past the time it should normally appear. If the stomach empties more slowly than normal as, for instance, by a narrowing of the stomach outlet by scar tissue, patients may go for days without hunger, always feeling as though they had just eaten.

Fat markedly delays the emptying of the stomach; therefore a high fat diet effectively alleviates hunger. Liquids leave the stomach rapidly and hunger contractions return more quickly. For this reason soup and other liquid foods do not "stay" with one.

Hungry rats, receiving blood transfusions from fed donor rats, eat much less than others, suggesting that hunger might be regulated, at least to some extent, by a hormone mechanism. Hunger does not depend upon the blood sugar level, and the existence of an *appetstat*, or hunger center in the brain, has never been accepted. Appetite-suppressing pills probably work in two directions: first, to reduce the force of hunger contractions, and second, by making the higher centers of the brain less receptive to peripheral and distressful stimuli.

Palatability of food does not affect the sensation of hunger, although it may play havoc with the appetite. A study of one thousand airmen, downed in the South Pacific during the war, revealed that such foods as ants, bugs, snails, worms, snakes, birds' eggs, leeches, monkeys, birds,

lizards, and the food from stomachs of birds and sharks, were eaten with relief of hunger and survival. [26] While this list of foods is revolting to Americans, it should be mentioned that these identical foods are considered as delicacies by many human societies at the present time. [23] [106-2] [38]

Hunger, then, is a physiological mechanism that is governed by strict laws and is not in the least affected by likes, dislikes, convention, social uses, breeding, education, intelligence, personal wishes, will power, or even species of animal. It is doubtful if eating purely for the appeasement of hunger is really a pleasure. In all probability it is merely the satisfaction, in a negative sense, of securing relief from an unpleasant sensation. If pleasure is a part of the process of alleviating hunger, appetite has entered the picture. To be sure, many complicated and sophisticated physiological and psychological studies have been done to study the nature of hunger, how it is controlled and elevated to the level of consciousness. For ease in understanding, however, it is best to think of hunger as a simple unconditioned reflex, already described.

While hunger is an inborn physiological mechanism, appetite is an acquired social endowment, a *conditioned* reflex.

Conditioned reflexes were first described and studied by the Russian physiologist, Pavlov. [20] In contrast to the unconditioned reflex, a conditioned reflex must be acquired through a process of training. Development of conditioned reflexes is the basis of all skill and learning.

A man is not born with the skill to ride a bicycle, operate a typewriter, play a musical instrument, drive an automobile, or even to walk. He must learn these skills through a process of trial and error. When the infant learns to make all of the correct movements, and none that are incorrect, he can walk. As an adult, if he makes all of the correct muscular movements, the result is a smooth, melodious, accurate or safe performance. If he makes a wrong choice, he falls and hurts himself or appears ridiculous, rends the symphony with a sour note, must retype a long letter, or will smash his expensive automobile. In other words, if he makes all of the correct movements he is pleased; if he does not, he is displeased or uncomfortable. Skill, then, consists of choos-

ing all the correct movements and avoiding the incorrect. Skill is the result of having established a certain conditioned reflex.

Obviously the violinist playing a brilliant and difficult cadenza in concert does not have time to examine each note, decide which movements of finger and bow are called for, and then execute them. His performance must be automatic, and to acquire this automaticity he spends long hours practicing so that he instinctively chooses and performs a complicated, integrated movement subconsciously, with no more of a stimulus than some black spots on a piece of paper.

The skilled typist might be handed a paragraph to copy at her greatest speed. At the end of the trial, if she were asked if she had touched the "H" key, she would be forced to answer that she could not recall whether she had actually performed this very complex action, involving both a mental choice and a muscular performance.

A properly established conditioned reflex, therefore, becomes a matter of making a correct choice in order to secure a desired effect or result and to do it *subconsciously*.

From birth, the human is exposed to countless stimuli each day. Some of these are pleasant and some are unpleasant. As the human grows and gains control of his choices it is only natural that he avoid the unpleasant stimuli whenever possible (the burned child dreads the hot stove) and enjoy the pleasant as often as is possible or practicable. Thus is a system of likes and dislikes developed which govern most of man's reactions, including his choice of spouse, occupation, recreation, religion, and—foods.

A young animal, be it human or subhuman, exhibits a certain innate (or unconditioned) choice of food when a large variety is offered to it. This normal selection of foods may be contraconditioned as shown by the following experiment.

If guinea pig litter mates are separated when weaned—one placed in a cage supplied with alfalfa pellets (the normal ration for guinea pigs), the other given only casein (normally not eaten by these animals)—the first pig will eat readily. The second pig, however, will eat reluctantly and only when quite hungry. After a month of such training, the litter mates are placed in a single cage with both rations

made available to each. The first animal will continue eating the alfalfa while the second continues to eat the casein, an abnormal food of which he has become fond, but only through a forced process of association or conditioning.

Therefore the fact that a certain animal may eat a certain food is not proof that such is a natural food for that animal.

This same business of contraconditioning happens to humans every day. At a certain age children are judged old enough for celery sticks and carrot curls in the diet. To the child these herbivorous offerings are worse than casein to the guinea pig. The child spits them out. Then Mother lays down the dictum—eat your celery sticks and carrot curls, or no meat and potatoes. The child is caught on the horns of the same dilemma as was the second guinea pig, so he munches the celery sticks and carrot curls to avoid starving. The child has already learned to choose the lesser of two evils. The child, like the second guinea pig, forced to eat an unpleasant food long enough, develops a liking for it. The little child forced to eat the celery sticks and carrot curls grows to be a young woman who would "simply die" without her roughage foods, and eventually she becomes a mother who starts still another generation on celery sticks and carrot curls, and so on *ad infinitum*.

Adults howl with glee at the grimace of distaste when a first bit of candy or sugar is placed in the infant's mouth. But Mother persists with sweetened fruits, puddings, and tastes of adult desserts, because she read somewhere that sugar was necessary for growth and energy. Fortunate indeed is this infant if he does not become a teenager addicted to ice cream, candy bars, and soda pop, and eventually the adult who snacks on chocolate sundaes and gobbles double desserts, wailing all the time that "everything I eat seems to go to flesh."

Anyone can condition their appetite to like most any food. For instance, do you like buttermilk? You don't? Good, you will be a good subject for our experiment. This is what I want you to do.

Twice each day gulp one ounce of buttermilk, as you would gulp a dose of medicine. After three days increase the

"dose" to two ounces, and after a week sip a full glass during lunch and again during dinner. You will find that you are beginning to like its clean acidic taste. After two weeks of drinking the buttermilk, try a glass of sweet milk. It will taste insipid by comparison. In a similar way you can condition yourself to relish any food you previously disliked, whether it be avocado, limburger cheese, fat, beer, spinach, fish, "high" meat, liver, snails, puppy dog's tails, or any other.

Economic circumstances act similarly in conditioning the appetite. The poor Roman plebeians who grew to like their salads, because that was all they could afford, have been mentioned. Only the prosperous members of a modern society can afford a high protein intake. Religious taboos and social customs often dictate dietary practices contrary to a natural human selection of foodstuffs.

Probably the greatest single influence on man's choice of foods today is the custom of eating together. A basic physiological function has become a social event. So far as I can determine, none of the others have.

In the Paleolithic era, when a man became hungry he would kill a rabbit or an elephant, eat his fill, and either go to sleep or be on his way. He could do this because the only problem connected with eating a meal was catching it. Early in the Neolithic era, after he discovered that his wheat required cooking before it was digestible, it was deemed foolish for each individual to cook his own miserable portion separately, by himself. Instead, a large boiler rock could cook enough wheat for several families. It was quite natural that people began eating in groups. As they sat at meals conversation became more and more important and before anyone realized it, hunger began to be imperceptibly replaced by appetite.

Women soon became the cooks of a community. They began to experiment with herbs, and new ways of cooking and combining foods. They made the satisfying of hunger a tasty process. For the first time people discovered they had an appetite. Wives of the community strove to outdo each other for the adulation of husband and village. The women responsible for each community feast strove to make it big-

ger, better, and more indigestible than the ones before.

This same process goes on today in each community of every city of all nations, large and small. Meals are eaten according to the clock, not when the stomach gets empty and painful. Because man eats before he has hunger contractions he has no hunger to appease, so he must choose his food to satisfy his appetite. A few drinks before dinner further impairs his judgment, and the foods he chooses are usually those to which he has been conditioned from childhood. They include celery sticks, carrot curls, and gooey desserts. They are high in carbohydrates and indigestible in the bargain.

Man wonders why he is putting on weight and has a stomach ache.

Because appetite is a conditioned reflex, it obeys the laws governing them.

The first law of the conditioned reflex is that it will grow weaker and eventually disappear if it is not used. For instance, the bicycle rider, the musician, the stenographer, and even the automobile driver, if separated for a long time from his device, will find himself awkward and inept when he first attempts to use it again. He is no longer the skilled and expert performer. His conditioned reflexes have been partially extinguished.

As this law relates to appetite it means simply that if a person refrains from eliciting the conditioned response of pleasure from a certain food, the craving for that food gradually disappears. He can view it with complete indifference while others at table eat it.

The second law states that a conditioned reflex, once extinguished, may be re-established by a fewer number of conditioning sessions than was necessary to establish it in the first place. Thus the bicycle rider, the musician, the typist, and the automobile driver need not practice for months or years to regain their lost art, it comes back much more quickly.

This second law, as it relates to appetite, means that the single indulgence in a forbidden food for which the individual had lost his "craving" will not result merely in transient pleasure, but will cause to spring forth immediately, in all its former strength, the craving he had originally. He

must again extinguish his conditioned reflex craving by rigidly avoiding the food until he is able to again view it with indifference.

Unhappily, many people do not possess the courage to do this and relapse miserably into overindulgence. This is the reason that "snitching" a bite of cake or candy is fatal to successful dieting.

The foregoing is the reason for a third law of conditioned reflexes. This law states that a conditioned response must exist at full strength, or not at all. It is sometimes called the "all or none law," and means that a conditioned craving for alcohol, sweets, gambling, or another man's wife, which has been established at a certain level, can never be controlled at a lower level even by the greatest will power. The individual must practice his craving at the maximum previous pace, or not at all. This is the way it works.

A person who finds he secures pleasure from smoking will, according to the law of conditioned reflexes, seek to elicit this pleasure as often as possible. Soon he finds that he has established his maximum consumption of cigarettes at two packages a day and decides to cut down on his smoking. He does this by limiting himself to a cigarette after each meal and at bedtime. He does this by sheer will power for a day or two, but each time he smokes he is reminded of the pleasure to be gained from eliciting this conditioned reflex. He looks forward more eagerly to each one of his controlled smokes, and the time between them seems to be getting longer and longer. His craving has been enhanced, not satisfied, by the limited number of cigarettes he has allowed himself. In a few days he will find "reasons" why he should have an extra cigarette from time to time, and in a very short period is back to two packages per day, or even more. So, cutting down doesn't work.

After a varying period of time he again resolves to quit, but this time he will stop altogether. After several weeks he has lost most of his craving and feels sure he will now be able to control his smoking at a lower level. The alcoholic in this position is sure that he now can drink like a gentleman. He again begins to smoke, three cigarettes the first day, four the second, six the third, twenty the fourth, and four pack-

ages the fifth. He may go without a cigarette for five years and be equally unable to smoke in moderation. He has learned that a conditioned reflex must exist at its highest level, or not at all. He now knows all about the "all or none law."

This same law prevents the chronic alcoholic from drinking in moderation, but allows him to exist happily with no alcohol at all. [56-1] It is this law that makes it impossible for the dieter to be halfway on a diet if it excludes foods from which he gains enjoyment when he eats them. This is why a bite of cake or even a small dessert nearly always triggers a candy binge.

So remember, if you go on a diet, stay on it strictly or not at all. It will be impossible to take the middle of the road. Remember that you are not hungry on any diet that does not drastically limit calories. You are merely suffering the frustration of a childish appetite. Remember that if you stay with it, the cravings and desire for forbidden foods will soon disappear and will not come back as long as you avoid those foods. Remember that eating just a little bit of them does not relieve the craving, but causes it to spring back in full force to badger you, until you again extinguish your conditioned reflex craving for the untouchables by avoiding them completely.

Remember the admonition of Vilhjalmur Stefansson: "You never get tired of your food if you have but one thing to eat."

Or, as Bacon so wisely said: "Abstinence is for me as easy as moderation would be difficult."

Chapter 17

DIET AND FUNCTIONAL DISTRESS

Functional digestive distress may be defined as a complex of unpleasant symptoms which have no organic disease causing them. Nearly 80% of patients consulting physicians today are suffering from no organic disease but are uncomfortable because of functional distress of various sorts.

Machines may appear to suffer from functional symptoms (malfunction) at times, but careful examination will invariably discover a broken part, a short circuit, improper operation, or some other remediable defect as the cause of its failure to operate normally. Machines are free of functional symptoms because they have no nervous system; therefore they have no sensations or emotions.

Living organisms do suffer from functional symptoms because they do have a nervous system. The more complicated the nervous system, the more apt is the organism to suffer functional distress. Therefore the human being, with his impossibly complicated brain and nervous system, is the champion sufferer from such disturbances.

Within wide limits machines do not react to their environment; within narrow limits living organisms do.

The function of the central nervous system is first, to keep the organism adjusted to its environment, and second, to protect and prolong its life. These two functions are accomplished by a series of conditioned and unconditioned re-

flexes, a few aspects of which were briefly discussed in the preceding chapter.

Man is kept adjusted to his environment by such unconditioned reflexes as those which open the capillaries and stimulate the sweat glands when the temperature is hot, and reverse the process when it is cold. Others adjust the force and rate of the heartbeat to correspond to the amount of work being done, while another reminds the man to eat, thus avoiding starvation. It would indeed be impossible to live if it were necessary to remember to take each breath; therefore nature causes respiration to be automatic, except when in a dangerous atmosphere such as smoke, noxious fumes, or under water. Under these circumstances the act of breathing is switched to conscious control. When the danger is past, the respiratory center goes back on automatic pilot.

Conditioned reflex muscular action has saved many creatures from death. The quicker and more effective the reflex muscular action is, the greater is its protective role. Animals and men train to become proficient fighters of all sorts. Falls down stairs, burns, twisted ankles, slips on ice, collisions, electric shocks, and all manner of minor casualties cause individuals to develop conditioned reflexes to protect themselves from these hazards in the future. Illness after eating toxic material effectively and specifically engenders in the victim a conditioned reflex aversion for that food, which prevents his making the same mistake twice.

The underlying emotion in all these instances is simply that of fear—the fear of being injured, of suffering pain, of being defeated, and the ultimate—fear of death.

All situations that cause the emotion of fear in animals or man produce a variety of protective conditioned reflexes, each one specific for a given situation.

Animals probably fear nothing very much except death. They do not appear to suffer much pain after injury and therefore probably have little fear of being hurt.

Thus when an animal experiences fear, it is because its life is at stake. It is up against an enemy with which it must fight for its life, or from which it must flee for its life. In either event, its attempt to stave off disaster involves an all-out physical effort.

Animals in nature cannot choose the time, place and circumstances for this major physical effort. An animal who has just eaten, has a colon filled with feces, or a urinary bladder filled with urine, is not in a proper condition to perform effectively or maximally. Nature has seen fit to equip animals caught in this predicament with a mechanism to quickly and effectively prepare them to fight or flee for their life. Under the stress of extreme fear, a generalized discharge of nervous impulses to the abdominal viscera causes the stomach to contract strongly. The animal vomits. The colon similarly contracts strongly, and the animal defecates. The bladder empties uncontrollably. In a twinkling the animal is prepared for its maximum physical effort.

Humans react in exactly the same manner to a stimulus of mortal fear, because our nervous system was given to us when we were wild animals and it has not been changed in the slightest by the application of a shallow veneer of civilization.

But modern humans rarely if ever experience terror. Instead we have innumerable smaller fears that beset us constantly. Many of these are social fears: the fear of creating a poor impression, the fear of being disliked, of a humiliating *faux pas*. Fears are often financial: loss of money and security, poor investments, debt, and insolvency. Fear of making a mistake besets accountants, engineers, physicians, businessmen, students—in fact everyone but the mendicant, who has already made his mistake and has nothing more to lose. Fear of unpleasantness is common in today's social intercourse. We are afraid we will be late, that it will rain, or that the soufflé will fall. We fear, with probable justification, for the morality of the Spock generation and world ethics. We fear war, heart attacks, alcoholism, cancer, inflation, and depression. Half the country fears a Republican government, the other half the Democratic, and everybody fears Communism. Not the slightest of man's fears is what is causing that pain in the abdomen that wakens him during the small hours of the morning. He is afraid to see a physician because he is certain it is cancer, and wants to delay the inevitable as long as possible.

No, humans do not very often experience mortal terror.

But their multitude of little fears pyramid into a fair-sized mountain which, while not causing an explosive catharsis, does result in a generalized speeding up of the digestive musculature, with a tendency to spasm and a disruption of the sequence of integrated movements we recognize as the normal pattern of intestinal motility.

The result is loss of digestive efficiency, and since the emotional abnormality is of long duration, the digestive malfunction continues day after day and week after week. Certain well-recognized functional digestive syndromes appear.

The simplest of these is *constipation*.

If we think of the digestive tract as a long production line, into the head end of which are fed certain materials, from the middle of which are withdrawn certain substances for use of the body, and from the nether end of which is ejected the waste material or substances of the diet which cannot be used, we have—for practical purposes—a reasonably accurate portrayal. In the absence of an organic disease causing actual obstruction of the colon, there is really no such thing as constipation. If one puts food into one end, waste material will eventually and inevitably emerge from the other. If this is so, why do so many people have so much trouble with the simple physiological activity of moving their bowels?

The answer is that most people do not understand or know what constitutes the normal, or an acceptable function of the colon. Such a great mass of misinformation has been gathered over the years that people are hopelessly misled in their ideas of how the colon should perform. For instance, nearly everybody believes their bowel should move every day, regardless of how much material has been fed into the head end of our production line, or whether all or practically none has been digested and absorbed. People believe in regularity, regardless of the fact that the function of the bowel is subject to many variables and therefore regularity is a virtual impossibility. They believe that if their bowel does not move daily one becomes poisoned by the retained material, but they do not know that defecation empties only the rectum, allowing the remainder of the colon to remain constantly full. Therefore they do not realize that if this were a valid thesis, they would be constantly poisoned by the iden-

tical material which fills the entire colon always, that *auto-intoxication* is merely a bogey existing only in the mind. Women do not realize that they constitute 90% of the constipated citizenry because their colon is usually over twice as long as that of the male, and that its function is consequently quite different. Yet a woman insists that her long colon behave the same as her husband's short one, and her spouse, with the attitude of an Olympic champion in that particular event, encourages this attitude.

There is a wonderfully convenient and immediate remedy for constipation, even though no remedy is really necessary. Take a laxative. The bowel moves copiously and, like the sinner who goes to church, the patient feels better, even though nothing has been cured or changed. The laxative has pushed out a lot of material that should have formed the next several stools, thus insuring that none will be forthcoming for the next three or four days. By that time the patient considers herself to be *still* constipated, takes another laxative, and thus perpetuates the need for further purgation.

The only problem is that laxatives are irritating to the entire digestive tract. Laxatives gradually lose their effectiveness. Their strength must be increased and they must be taken more frequently. It does not take much of this medicinal sandpapering of the digestive tract to cause a change in symptoms. Instead of merely being unable to have a bowel movement, the patient may now complain of abdominal cramps and soft, sticky, ribbon-like stools. Expelling the latter is most unsatisfactory and leaves the patient with a feeling of frustration. Instead of recognizing that she is no longer constipated but is verging on diarrhea, patients again increase the dosage or find a more potent cathartic.

Simple constipation has by now given way to colitis, also called irritable colon, functional bowel distress, spastic or mucus colitis, chronic functional diarrhea, and a host of other synonyms.

The proper treatment of constipation, which one should remember is a symptom complex without any disease to cause it, can follow either of two courses. First, the patient can do nothing at all about it: stop all laxatives, continue to

eat, and wait for something to happen. The second course is to stop all laxatives, continue to eat, and use certain measures, which are not irritating, to stimulate the bowels.

In the first instance the patient may wait for a week before her bowel moves and this business of sitting on a supposed time bomb for a week requires fortitude beyond the capacity of most individuals. This period of trial and travail is best endured within the protective environment of the hospital. Finally the great day comes, and she moves her bowel without a laxative! But this was too easy; there must be a gimmick in the picture somewhere. Come to think of it, that stool wasn't a very big one, and the color was a little bit off. She examines her tongue carefully in the mirror and sure enough, there seems to be a little coating on it, and is that a little blotch coming on her complexion? All of the old false tenets of daily stools, regularity, auto-intoxication, and the other bugaboos preached by the laxative merchants and food faddists spring back to stark reality. She goes home and takes a small enema or just a little laxative to get things going again and is right back where she started.

The second acceptable treatment for constipation does not cure it, for there is nothing to cure. It only makes the condition bearable. Simply by increasing the traffic of undigestible material through the digestive tract it will be found that the rectum fills more rapidly, and the bowel consequently moves more often—once daily if the additional bulk is of sufficient quantity. This bulk material, however, must be non-irritating or the patient might as well continue taking laxatives. Since all laxative habits have caused the colon to be irritable, the non-irritating low carbohydrate diet should be used at the beginning of treatment. A number of bulk materials are available in the drug store. Choose one, however, that does not contain added laxatives. A heaping teaspoonful of this material taken with each meal and at bedtime should prove sufficient to afford a satisfactory stool within three or four days and thereafter at intervals of one, two, or three days so long as the bulk substance is taken.

The bulk material is hygroscopic, that is, it resists the effort of the colon to absorb water from the feces and thus

prevents them from becoming hard and impacted while waiting for the bowel to start moving.

In my experience, exercising, assuming odd positions for defecation, drinking excessive water and sitting on the seat for hours at a time are not effective in securing a bowel movement unless the bowel is already moving along quite satisfactorily.

Only a few patients with colitis reach that diagnosis via the laxative route. Most of them develop irritability of the colon through a combination of nervousness and irritating foods in the diet. As detailed earlier in this chapter, nervousness greatly speeds up transit of foods through the intestinal tract, decreasing the length of time available for their adequate digestion, with the resulting deposition of undigested carbohydrate material in the colon. This allows the fermentation and acid production previously mentioned in Chapter 14. The patient gets worried about the new symptoms and fears serious disease. She gets more nervous and this makes the irritable colon worse. The patient is now on the "vicious cycle" merry-go-round.

The symptoms of colitis are classic in their simplicity. They may be listed:

1. Cramp-like abdominal pain which is felt low in the abdomen and causes a desire to move the bowel. This pain is usually made worse by eating. It arises from the colon which, being irritable, overacts to the normal stimulus of eating.
2. The stools lose their normal firmness and become narrow, ragged chunks, possibly the size of one's little finger. The bowel tends to move several times a day in small amounts and often shortly after meals.
3. A feeling of incompleteness follows defecation. This is the sensation that stool remains in the rectum but cannot be expelled. Patients strain to expel further stool, and in so doing evert the lining of the rectum so that in cleaning, a spot of blood may be seen on the tissue.
4. The colon, in attempting to protect itself from its irritating acid content, secretes excessive amounts of mucus which appears along with the stool or as a separate dis-

charge. This mucus at times dries in the form of sheets or ropes, and patients report that they have passed a sloughed-off portion of the bowel lining or a large, long worm. These happenings do nothing to add to the patient's composure.

5. The stool, instead of being firm and encased in a thin film of mucus which causes it to drop cleanly from the rectum at the end of defecation, is soft, mucoid, and sticky. After defecation, a portion of this stool is left clinging to the skin around the anus and makes adequate cleaning impossible short of bathing the area. This causes the patient to complain that she believes fecal material seeps from the rectum and stains the clothing. That this is not seepage may be demonstrated by the absence of soiling if the area about the anus is washed after each bowel movement.
6. It is impractical for most patients to keep this area clean by washing after each defecation, and the adherent fecal material sets up a chronic irritation with itching and skin eruption. The acid stools cause a sensation of burning in the rectum after moving the bowel.

About the time a full-blown case of colitis has developed, flatulent indigestion adds its train of symptoms to those from the colon.

As briefly mentioned previously, after the colon becomes irritable it begins to send out distress signals to the remainder of the digestive tract. The stomach and esophagus are particularly sensitive to these and they in turn become spastic and irritable.

The esophagus manifests its irritability as isolated spasms which cause the feeling of a lump or a sensation of pressure in the chest. This feeling of pressure is interpreted by the patient as coming from some gas that has "formed" in his digestive tract. He forces "burps" or belches in an effort to get rid of what he believes is gas but which, as already mentioned, is merely a muscular spasm of the esophagus. In the process of "burping," the individual gulps down an amazing amount of air. It is this air which, passing through the

digestive tract, is the "gas" that makes so many individuals miserable.

Little belches or burps are always volitional, that is, they are voluntary acts which are as deliberate as the act of scratching an itch. Emotional stress may cause these esophageal spasms to come on, and many individuals recognize that a spell of nervousness will precipitate a gas attack. Eating, which stimulates motility of the digestive tract, will also cause these spasms to appear, explaining why nervous people so often burp and belch after meals. This relationship of eating to burping gives rise to the illusion that the ingested food is giving off clouds of gas of which the patient must rid himself to secure comfort. He therefore works industriously at belching and burping, and in doing so literally pumps himself full of air.

A nervous stomach, instead of relaxing in response to food entering it, remains tight and spastic. A very small amount of food makes the patient feel as though he had just finished a full meal. He thinks gas must have formed to make him feel so full; he burps and belches in an effort to bring up gas which isn't there, and gives himself a spell of gaseousness.

If a meal has been composed of insoluble food such as tossed salad, beans, cabbage, etc., or fat, the stomach empties very slowly. Several hours after the meal, the individual still feels as though he had just eaten. This again is interpreted as gas pressure and triggers another series of burps and belches, with more air being ingested.

Fruit juices, and alcohol before the meal, too much food, rich desserts, coffee, and sweet liqueurs after, all stimulate production of excessive gastric acid and effectively set the stage for an attack of indigestion! Burping and belching maneuvers succeed in getting some of this acid up and into the tender esophagus, and a new symptom—heartburn or sour stomach—may appear.

Meanwhile, the air that has been ingested begins to leave the stomach and starts a long journey through the entire digestive tract, eventually reaching the rectum, from which it is expelled as *flatus*. During its transit through the

small intestine, this gas (air) is mixed with dissolved foods, digestive fluids and dietary liquids. Whenever a combination of gas and liquid is agitated, it makes a noise. It gurgles, splashes, rumbles, and bubbles. Similarly, when the air and liquid contents of the small intestine are propelled around twists, turns, bends, and loops of the intestine, it gives rise to various rumbles; squeaks, whistles, gurgles, and growls which are quite apparent to the patient and those nearby. It sounds to the individual so afflicted as if there must be a narrow place through which things are being forced under great pressure, a bowel obstruction, cancer—or? The patient now has something else to worry and frighten him.

As the gas reaches the relatively sluggish colon, it tends to accumulate in larger bubbles, which become trapped behind twists, turns, and kinks normally present in that organ. It takes a mighty contraction by the colon to dislodge this gas and move it along. These strong contractions are apparent to the patient as gas pains.

It requires about eight hours for any particular bit of air introduced into the stomach to make this journey through the digestive tract to the rectum, from which it may be expelled. During sleep, any air that is in the digestive tract continues to move downward. It reaches the rectum and leaks out during the night. In the morning patients waken with the abdomen flat, free of gas, and comfortable. After breakfast they begin to "burp air down" from time to time and it begins its downward journey, with all the attendant gurglings, splashings, rumblings, and bubblings. However, the vanguard of gas does not reach the rectum for eight hours or more. Thus, air is being pumped into the top of the digestive tube, but none has yet left the bottom. The ingested air occupies space and the individual becomes progressively bloated. By late afternoon the girth has increased so that the patient is uncomfortable. Off comes girdles, belts, and other impedimentia. Eating dinner usually speeds up the transit through the digestive tract so that shortly after the meal the patient begins to expel *flatus*.

He looks accusingly at his wife and says, "That stew you cooked for dinner sure gassed me up!"

Actually the air expelled after dinner had been taken into the stomach by burps performed many hours before, and had nothing whatsoever to do with his evening meal. After a couple of hours of television, the patient goes to bed. His accumulated gas leaks out of the rectum during the night and he awakes to a new day, flat and comfortable, and ready to repeat the whole process all over again.

It may be of psychological significance that bloated women always describe themselves as if they were "six months pregnant."

Most students of gastroenterology agree that only infinitesimal amounts of gas are formed or generated within the digestive tract. Practically all of the flatulence from which man suffers is air which has been introduced into the stomach. Swallowing will put a small amount of gas in the stomach. This is inescapable, and explains why everyone has an occasional discrete rumble from the abdomen and expels a puff of *flatus* from time to time. Significant excesses of gas which cause unpleasant symptoms result from burping, belching, or trying to belch. If the gaseous person can recognize that all these accomplishments are voluntary acts, and if he can disregard feelings of gas from his esophagus or stomach, and if he can stop his burping and belching, he will have no more gas than the normal person.

It is, however, not easy to stop belching and burping which has become habitual over the years. First off, patients must accept that belching and burping *do not ever* get rid of gas, that belching and burping *always* succeed only in introducing air into the stomach. If one has tried to stop belching and burping but has been unsuccessful, a simple trick will be helpful. Instantly, on perceiving an urge to belch, take the deepest breath possible, hold it for ten or fifteen seconds, then exhale slowly. In most instances the spasm will have relaxed and the feeling of wanting to belch will have disappeared. If it hasn't, take another deep breath immediately and hold it. It may take three or even four of these deep breaths before the feeling of a desire to belch disappears completely. Do this whenever the feeling of gas appears and in time the desire to belch will gradually disappear.

The small volume and easy solubility of the low carbohydrate diet is most helpful in getting rid of this troublesome symptom.

The concept of what constitutes a bland diet is extremely variable from person to person, and even among physicians. Most people subscribe to a vague idea of mechanical irritation and studiously avoid fried foods and those containing seeds, fibers, roughage, particulate matter of any sort, grease, nuts, pickles, and so forth indefinitely. It would seem that blandness in diet is usually judged by what feels soft to the fingertips, which would be quite a good criterion if we were selecting a diet non-irritating to the fingertips.

Everybody accidentally swallows spicules of sharp bone occasionally, as well as sand, small stones, pieces of string, fruit seeds and pits, and even bits of glass. None of these seem to cause any sort of irritation of the digestive tract. Nervous people bite off and swallow razor sharp fragments of fingernail and mental patients ingest all sorts of nails, pins, bones, hair, plaster, wood splinters, keys, coins, and spoons—all without apparent damage to the stomach or intestines. Sideshow performers casually crush a razor blade or light globe and swallow the fragments, [74-27] while men of science with equal indifference swallow handfuls of glass beads, metal and plastic telemetering devices and long rubber tubes with hard metal tips. It has been said that a famous physiologist regularly ate a whole baked chicken, including all the bones, to demonstrate for his students the immunity of the digestive tract to mechanical injury.

In view of these facts, it is difficult to believe that a wilted scrap of lettuce could scrape and injure the lining of the colon, or that a fragment of peanut could commit mayhem upon the stomach and intestine or assault and battery to the colon. If we then discard this idea of mechanical irritation as a cause of digestive problems, there remains only the possibility of chemical irritation caused by the process of fermentation, which has already been fully examined.

The avoidance of chemical irritation is best accomplished by the low carbohydrate diet. It will be found to effectively alleviate the complaints of the great majority of mankind that suffers from functional digestive distress.

A note of caution: symptoms caused by functional distress are often indistinguishable from those resulting from organic disease. The decision as to whether you are suffering from functional or organic symptoms must be made by a physician.

Chapter 18

DIET AND ORGANIC DISEASE

World-wide study of various races and cultures has revealed a startling relationship between diet and the presence of many organic diseases. In general, diet-dependent diseases fall into two categories: 1) those caused by deficiencies of protein or fat in the diet; and 2) those caused by over-consumption of carbohydrates. Not infrequently over-consumption of carbohydrates, especially of the highly refined sorts (sugar, flour, starch), will crowd out other foods, with a consequent deficiency of animal proteins and fats. [32] This situation is found not only in present-day primitive agricultural communities but in modern, prosperous, civilized societies as well. Rarely indeed is there a deficit of total calories in modern diets except in famine belts, such as some areas of South America and India. Diseases secondary to vitamin deficiencies will be discussed in a subsequent chapter.

Diseases caused by protein deficiencies may occur even though more than adequate vegetable protein is consumed. The most dramatic of these protein deficiency diseases was described first on the Gold Coast of Africa in 1929 by a remarkable woman pediatrician, Dr. Cicely D. Williams. [14] [32] [60-3] [88-1] [91-21] African nurses, already familiar with this disorder, had named it *kwashiorkor*, a native term meaning "weaning disease of babies when a new one is on the way." Nursing mothers, upon becoming pregnant, would

abruptly wean the suckling child and put it on the markedly protein-deficient adult diet of maize, cassava, or plantain characteristic of the region. Sudden cessation of the animal protein of the mother's milk and the substitution of low-grade and deficient vegetable protein was responsible for the disease that followed. The mortality from *kwashiorkor* ranged from 30% to 90% until it was discovered that animal proteins, such as dried milk protein, fish flour, eggs, and meat were specifically curative. Failure of the child with *kwashiorkor* to grow is not from lack of calories or growth hormone, [76-6] but simply because insufficient amino acids of the proper types are present to allow growth to occur. That this disease occurs in other than primitive societies is illustrated by the fact that at least three cases have been documented occurring in the United States. [91-7] It is impossible to say if many milder cases may have remained undiagnosed.

It has been pointed out that infantile pellagra of past years would today be diagnosed as *kwashiorkor*—not a vitamin deficiency but a lack of animal proteins in the diet [60-3].

A more widely spread disease, first becoming manifest in adults, is seen in individuals who, in infancy and early childhood, were subjected to markedly protein deficient diets. [92-5] This protein deprivation during the period of most rapid growth and development of the central nervous system caused in it irreparable damage. [92-9] It has been shown that these brain-damaged experimental animals [91-10] and infants grow to maturity with defective intellect, impaired ability to learn, and difficulty in achieving social integration. [32] Adults subjected to protein deficiency of equal degree do not appear to be similarly permanently affected.

The liver appears to get along quite well on any reasonable general diet containing even minimal amounts of animal protein. However, if the liver is exposed to infection or hepatotoxic material, such as alcohol, in large amounts and at frequent intervals, the best prophylaxis against damage by such exposure is a diet very high in animal protein. It has been observed that cirrhosis of the liver is much more common among indigent alcoholics (whose diet contains very

little of the expensive animal proteins), as compared to well-to-do alcoholics who consume meals rich in such proteins. [70-1] Experimental evidence shows that a high protein diet is almost entirely effective in preventing cirrhosis of the liver in "drinking" animals. [88-7]

This talk of high protein diets and alcoholic tippling suggests the plot of a drama, [74-23] which has been entitled "The Dilemma of the Executive Drinker." Cast in the title role is a businessman who consumes 2,400 calories of nourishment each day, 1,800 of them from alcohol. In order to protect his liver he must almost double the amount of protein he is eating, but in order to avoid weight gain, the caloric intake must be kept steady at 2,400 calories. One need not be omniscient to see a drastic reduction of carbohydrate calories as the only possible final act denouement, all of which is strongly reminiscent of a whimsical pamphlet, [39] "The Drinking Man's Diet," which has been (unjustly in my opinion) castigated by nutritionists from Cambridge to Chicago and points west.

While high protein intake has been shown to be best for moderately damaged livers, the end result of liver disease is a most unfortunate state, in which amino acids can no longer be handled and a condition called ammonia intoxication appears. At this point of no return in liver disease, proteins are best avoided in the diet.

Gallstones and diseases of the gallbladder are often the results of deficient fat in the diet. As was described earlier, the presence of fat in the diet causes the gallbladder to contract, expelling its contents into the intestine to aid in digesting the fat. This periodic evacuation secured by a sufficiently fatty diet is in effect a cleansing of the organ; when it does not occur the contained bile becomes thickened and concentrated to the point where some elements of the bile, such as cholesterol and bile pigments, may be precipitated in the form of stones. Stagnation in the inactive gallbladder also allows infection to gain a foothold which, in addition to encouraging the formation of gallstones, results in a gradual thickening of the organ, loss of function, or acute inflammation.

Peptic ulcer is defined as any ulcer of the digestive tract

that is formed by acid-pepsin digestion. Both these substances (hydrochloric acid and pepsin) are found in the gastric juices. They facilitate dissolution of food within the stomach in order to render it more readily digestible by the pancreatic juice. If the precise location of a peptic ulcer is known, then it is so designated as: gastric ulcer (within the stomach); duodenal ulcer (within the duodenum), etc. A patient cannot have a peptic ulcer if his stomach is unable to secrete both hydrochloric acid and pepsin. Conversely, he is more apt to form an ulcer if the acid and pepsin are present in excess or are not neutralized by food. Since both acid and pepsin work exclusively on protein, [14] [57-1] it may be seen that a high protein intake will cause them to expend themselves on the ingested foods rather than on the walls of the stomach or duodenum. [91-25] Carbohydrate foods neutralize acid and pepsin poorly and therefore are poor foods for the peptic ulcer patient. [76-3] While it cannot be stated unequivocally that the average high carbohydrate diet eaten today is the cause of peptic ulcer, the treatment of this condition by such diet is often unsatisfactory even with ancillary measures, such as frequent dosing with anti-acids and drugs to decrease the stomach's secretions. Many problem peptic ulcers heal promptly on the rigid low carbohydrate diet, even with minimal drug therapy. This regimen is especially beneficial to the obese ulcer patient, who has gained a great deal of weight secondary to frequent eating and milk-drinking to secure temporary relief of pain.

Abundant dietary fat is also necessary in the treatment of peptic ulcer. It has been shown that fat in the duodenum evokes a substance (*enterogastrone*) which is specific in decreasing the production of acid and pepsin, and is even thought to exert a protective role against recurrence once the ulcer has healed. [14] Every gastroenterologist is familiar with the marked improvement in the peptic ulcer patient after adequate fat has been added to his diet.

Patients with peptic ulcer frequently have a distressing gas problem caused by spasm and disordered motility of the esophagus and stomach. Frequent regurgitation of acid and pepsin into the esophagus results in an actual inflammation of that organ, increased pain, and even ulceration and bleed-

ing. Patients with this secondary esophagitis will be greatly benefited by the low volume and high acid-pepsin buffering power of the low carbohydrate diet.

While the preceding are diseases known to be caused or aggravated by a low intake of animal protein and fat, the converse—a disease caused by an excessive use of animal protein or fat—has never been described. Gout is an hereditary disease, already present at birth long before the individual ever tasted his first meat. Even though it is a metabolic abnormality in which the amino acid glycine forms abnormally large amounts of uric acid, modern students of the disease have shown that the severity of gout is not decreased by protein restriction. [33] Chronic nephritis (kidney disease), formerly treated by protein restriction, is now best managed in most cases with a full diet of animal protein.

Organic diseases, caused not by protein deficiency but by over-consumption of carbohydrates are too numerous to discuss fully and in detail. Only a few of the most common will be listed.

Diabetes is probably the most widespread and important disease in this category. This disorder appears to be of two types. The first has been known for many years and is severe, with onset in early life. It is doubtless hereditary and is often most difficult to treat. The second is mild, with maturity onset, and is not so clearly hereditary. This is the type which appears to be getting so much more common. Fortunately it is easily treated. It is this second type of diabetes that is diet-dependent. [91-1]

Mass screening of unselected individuals in San Jose, California, revealed that one in six of those tested showed evidence of diabetes. [91-3] In 1962 the U. S. Public Health Department estimated three million diabetics in the country. Today the figure is four million. [74-21] It is believed that for every two million known diabetics, at least 1,400,000 remain undiscovered. [91-4] The incidence of diabetes is rising four times faster than the population. [88-5] These figures were supported by a Chicago study which revealed that 20% of those random-tested revealed diabetes. [86-1] The incidence

of diabetes among veterans is thought to be as high as 30%. [90-2]

Diabetes has become extremely common in the Maori tribesmen of New Zealand, thought to be due to the diet, which is high in carbohydrates and fat. [92-2] While not a single case of juvenile diabetes (inherited) has been found among the meat- and fat-eating Eskimo population of Alaska, eight cases of the maturity onset type of diabetes (acquired) have been recently unearthed. [74-16] These appear to be the result of increasing carbohydrates in the modern Eskimo diet.

That high carbohydrate intake, particularly of refined foods such as sugar and flour, may be of importance in this growing tide of diabetes, has long been suspected. The rising incidence of diabetes has kept pace with the ever-increasing consumption of sugar, flour and starch. It has been shown that the percentage of diabetes among Yemenites recently migrated to Israel is much lower than that of age-paired settled Yemenites who had lived in Israel for twenty-five years. [76-2] The only difference in diet of these two ethnically homogeneous groups was a ninefold increase in sugar consumption by the settled Yemenites. Indians of the Pima reservation, [92-4] whose food consists of corn, squash, beans and wheat, have a very high incidence of diabetes, amounting to fifteen times that of the general population. Neighboring tribes of nomadic sheepherders have about the same degree of diabetic disease as does the general population. It was noted that during World War II, with its attendant flour and sugar restrictions, the usual increase in diabetic cases did not occur. Natal Indians consume about ten times the amount of sugar as Indians in general, and have ten times as much diabetes. [57-2]

Management of mild diabetic patients of the maturity onset type by low carbohydrate diets has been advocated and used, with the apparent result of postponing indefinitely the appearance of clinical or symptomatic diabetes. Those with evidence of quite severely decreased sugar tolerance have been managed satisfactorily, often without oral insulin. It has been shown that if protein and fat is eaten by the diabetic at the same time as a standard glucose tolerance test, the

rise in blood sugar is dramatically less than if the glucose is ingested alone. Following a low carbohydrate meal the blood sugar does not rise abnormally but may persist at about the fasting level for a greater time. Diabetics who lose significant amounts of sugar in the urine while eating an average general diet have been shown to lose little or none after being placed on a low carbohydrate diet. My experience with maturity onset diabetics subsisting on the low carbohydrate diet has been most satisfying, and agrees with that of other investigators.

A clinical syndrome, closely related to diabetes, yet a diametric opposite, is hypoglycemia, a disorder caused by abnormally low blood sugar. Hypoglycemia may be organic, caused by a tumor of the insulin-secreting tissue of the pancreas, which drives the blood sugar down until symptoms are produced. Much more commonly hypoglycemia is a functional disturbance, caused by eating candy or other saccharine substances without any other food. A pure carbohydrate, such as sugar, requires but little digestion and is quickly absorbed. This results in a quick flooding of the blood stream with glucose, which invokes a maximal secretion of insulin by the pancreas. Within a very short time—possibly thirty minutes—all of the ingested sugar has been absorbed. There is now no more sugar being fed into the bloodstream. However the pancreas, busily responding with all its might, does not know this and continues to pour insulin into the bloodstream. By now the only glucose left for the insulin to consume is the blood sugar itself. It plummets to a very low level. It has been mentioned previously that the brain and central nervous system is absolutely dependent upon glucose for its continued functioning. Consequently, with the lowered level of glucose reaching it, brain function is impaired and dizziness, unconsciousness, and even convulsions may occur. If protein, fat, or more slowly digestible carbohydrates are eaten at the same time as the candy, there is a continuous feeding of glucose into the bloodstream over a much longer period, which prevents the lowering of blood sugar to dangerous levels.

Hypoglycemia is frequently one of the earliest symptoms of diabetes, and this fact has caused speculation that the re-

peated maximal demands on the pancreas for insulin might in some manner cause exhaustion of this insulin-producing tissue and thus be at least partly responsible for the appearance of diabetes. Another undesirable effect of hypoglycemic attacks is the slight but definite and cumulative damage that the disorder causes to the central nervous system. Damage of this sort is especially prone to cause irreparable changes in infants and young children. Functional hypoglycemia can be avoided by always "covering" a large intake of sugar, such as candy, with other foods that are more slowly digested and absorbed, or, better yet, by avoiding the use of candy and other sweets altogether.

Another recently described diet-linked disease is that of previously mentioned lactose, or milk intolerance. [14] [55-2] Lactose, the sugar found in sweet milk, is what is known as a disaccharide, that is, it is composed of a combination of two simple sugars (monosaccharides). The two sugars that combine to form lactose are glucose and galactose. Disaccharides cannot be absorbed by the intestines. They must be broken down by enzymes into their respective monosaccharides. The enzyme that accomplishes this digestion is formed in the cells lining the small intestine. Often, for no known reason, this enzyme disappears from the intestine of some individuals. When this happens lactose can no longer be digested. It reaches the colon, where it is fermented with the production of lactic acid, which causes the severe diarrhea previously described. Cane or beet sugar (sucrose), also a disaccharide (glucose + fructose), is capable of causing similar diarrhea in some persons. Avoiding the two sugars, as well as foods containing them, will cure diarrhea of this sort.

Sprue is another condition that is specifically caused by diet. [14] It is called a gluten-induced *enteropathy*, because it is a disease of the intestine caused by the gluten which is found in most cereals. To individuals who have inherited this disorder, gluten causes a thickening of the intestinal lining which greatly interferes with absorption of vitamins, nutrients (especially fat), and minerals such as iron and calcium. The thickened intestinal lining may also be incapable of producing enzymes for digesting disaccharides, and lactose or sucrose intolerance may appear concurrently. The

condition is specifically alleviated, but not cured, by avoiding all cereal grains which contain gluten. Corn and rice are the only common cereals which do not contain gluten.

Two diseases of modern living—chronic ulcerative colitis and regional enteritis—affect the digestive tract. The rarity of these conditions in primitive societies and their occurrence in these same primitives when transplanted to a complicated modern life, had led to the suggestions that they are diseases of civilization. [76-8] High carbohydrate intake, with its attendant acidity of the colon and an abnormal bacterial population, has been blamed. Almost uniform improvement after discontinuing sweet milk in the diet has suggested milk intolerance, either on the basis of lactose intolerance or possibly allergic sensitivity to milk itself, to be of importance in these diseases. [55-1] [76-5] That regional enteritis is a disease of modern times is shown by the fact that it was first described by Dr. Burril B. Crohn in 1935. Prior to World War II, ulcerative colitis was also a rarity. I encountered but a single case of this disorder between 1935 and 1941. During the war years, spent mostly on gastro-intestinal wards of Naval hospitals, only three cases were found. Today, at least two patients with ulcerative colitis are referred to my office each week. The incidence of these diseases may be seen to roughly parallel the prominence of sugar, raw fruits, raw vegetables, and sweet milk in the modern diet. In my experience, the use of a careful low carbohydrate diet has been of vital importance in managing these cases.

Except for the sake of one's vanity, obesity by itself probably causes no intense desire to eradicate it. Yet many associated physical abnormalities begin to appear as obesity develops, making it an actual disease to be treated and corrected. Actuarial figures prove conclusively that man shortens his life to the degree that he is overweight.

Anthropologists and paleopathologists have failed to come up with any evidence that prehistoric man was ever obese. Primitive cave artists have depicted obese animals but never an overweight hunter. It was not long after the advent of agriculture and addition of carbohydrates to man's diet that obesity began to appear. It became more common after massive refining of flour was instituted 200 years ago, and

grew even more rapidly when a practical method of refining sugar was discovered in 1845. [57-2] [108-13]

It is doubtless significant that the obese of early historic times were usually personages of importance in the community, suggesting the fundamental cause of obesity to be overeating and underworking. Overeating today is acknowledged and widespread. The growing lack of exercise in our modern society is due to a burgeoning push-button technology. The specific cure of obesity would then appear to be a combination of exercise and a restriction of calories.

Studies of exercise physiologists, however, have painted a discouraging picture of any beneficial role exercise might play in the cure of obesity. For instance, a man must walk a half-mile to burn up the energy in a single peanut, seven miles to consume the calories in an ice cream sundae. A very modest 1,500 calories of a mixed diet will furnish energy for a twenty-mile walk, [76-1] three hours of swimming, six hours cycling, or over two hours of jogging at six miles per hour. A diet containing 2,500 calories per day, which is rather dainty eating, allows 1,000 calories to keep the individual alive plus 1,500 calories to accomplish the above-mentioned exercises. In order to reduce without exercise it is necessary to restrict daily food to about 1,000 calories. No American could subsist on this picayune diet for life, nor is the average American in a position to fritter away half of each day exercising. Therefore, if neither caloric restriction nor physical exercising is an answer to the problem of obesity, the only avenue of escape remaining is a return to the low carbohydrate diet of prehistoric man. Such a dietary attack on obesity has been used too many times, by too many physicians, on too many patients, with too much success, to require further proof of its safety and efficacy. By merely drastically reducing the modern carbohydrate foods man sheds his unwanted pounds, the diseases associated with obesity, regains his self-respect, and will have a dietary regime he can follow for the rest of his life, all without getting out of his easy chair.

Another disease of civilization—dental caries—is generally agreed to be diet dependent. [76-3] A prominent orthodontist observes that the Eskimo is paying for civilization

with his teeth! Again, carbohydrate has been indicted as the villain. When M.G.M. filmed *Mutiny on the Bounty* in Tahiti, casting directors were horrified to find practically no Polynesian girls with teeth. This sad condition was the result of their civilized diet—far too much carbohydrate and far too little protein. Today, by the age of ten, caries is rampant; by their late teens, half the Tahitians need dentures. [105-1] Caries is not confined to backward sub-tropical countries. In the United States, 95% of the children will have tooth disease before age ten, one out of six will have no natural teeth at age forty-five, and by age sixty [106-6] the figure will be three out of six. More than 13% of the general population today (over 20 million) have lost all their teeth, and dental problems are increasing in spite of major advances in the professional care of teeth and gums. [108-2] In a study of three hundred Iowa school children, ages six to fifteen, only five were found to be free of caries or fillings. [58-1] I can attest to the rarity of patients of any age with perfect teeth—possibly one or two among several hundred.

What has caused this sudden crumbling of human teeth? There is abundant evidence that American aborigines—the Indian and Eskimo—had strong and enduring teeth until civilized dietary influences appeared. [7] [23] Stefansson has presented a perfectly controlled observation of Icelanders under two circumstances, the first being a period (A.D. 870-1200) when these people ate European food. [41] During this period caries and dental problems were present. During the second period (A.D. 1200-1800) Icelanders had no contact with the outside world: They subsisted solely on native foods of milk products, mutton, beef, fish and Iceland moss, a lichen used in soups. Caries was not present during this time. After 1800 commerce with the outside world resumed, diet reverted to European foods, and dental caries reappeared. In all three periods the presence or absence of dental caries corresponded accurately with the presence or absence of carbohydrate in the diet.

Dental authorities are unanimous in charging the present high rate of dental disease to carbohydrate—especially sugar—in the diet. [99-1] Listed as prime offenders are

candy, soft drinks, juices, mints and breath sweeteners, pies, cakes, and desserts. [27] Vitamin deficiency as the cause is derided. Acid fermentation of carbohydrates by the acidophilus organism was pinpointed as the exact cause. [74-14] The suggested remedy is a virtual ban on sugar and marked restriction of other carbohydrate in the diet. [108-3]

Intestinal parasitosis is known to be much more common in the tropics than in temperate zones. It is believed that the carbohydrate-rich diet of most tropical cultures is responsible for the wide prevalence of such diseases in that area. Some intestinal parasites, such as the amoeba, [92-6] are dependent upon certain strains of bacteria for their survival. A low carbohydrate diet will greatly reduce the numbers of these organisms and will be helpful as well in starving out other parasites dependent upon carbohydrate as a food source.

Arthritis, a common plague of modern society, exists in two major forms: osteoarthritis (caused by wear and tear and consequently present only in the middle-aged or elderly), and rheumatoid arthritis (caused by infection or other unknown causes and present at all ages). It has been pointed out that osteoarthritis has been found by paleopathologists in the most ancient skeletal remains of man and animals. Rheumatoid arthritis, however, appeared first about 2750 B.C., about the time consumption of cereal grains had become widespread. This type of arthritis is never found in animal remains. Neither is rheumatoid arthritis ever found in skeletal remains of corn-eating peoples, such as the ancient Peruvians, but it has been found to be uniformly present in races eating wheat, rye, and oats. This finding suggests that rheumatoid arthritis is similar to sprue, a gluten-induced arthropathy. (92-1) (see chapter 18, page 190).

It is well-known that in many individuals carbohydrate in the diet causes a marked rise in the amount of fat in the blood. This observation has given rise to the belief that excessive carbohydrate in the diet is an important cause of acute inflammation of the pancreas, a commonly fatal disease. [81-1] This whole problem of elevated cholesterol, blood fats, fatty acids, etc., collectively spoken of as lipids, and their relationship to heart disease, strokes, and other cir-

culatory disorders, has become such a complicated and controversial subject that it requires careful and complete examination in a separate chapter.

Chapter 19

FAT IS NOT A DIRTY WORD

Since we will be talking about cholesterol and fat for the next few pages, let's learn something about these controversial substances. Cholesterol is white and waxy. It is classed chemically as an alcohol, not a fat, although it is found in association with animal fat and egg yolk. Plant fats and oils do not contain cholesterol.

The human body absorbs about $\frac{1}{3}$ of a gram of cholesterol (1/12 of a teaspoon) per day from animal fat in the average diet. The dietary intake of cholesterol may be increased fivefold without increasing the level of this substance in the blood. In addition to the dietary intake of cholesterol, human tissues, chiefly the liver, manufacture two grams each day, which is about six times the amount secured from the diet. This synthesis of cholesterol by the body goes on at a constant pace regardless of how much cholesterol is eaten. Therefore, efforts to reduce blood cholesterol by dietary restriction of this substance would appear to be of limited value. [33] [63-1]

Cholesterol is an important component of nervous tissue and many hormones. It is also of value in the synthesis of certain vitamins. The human body gets rid of cholesterol by excretion in the bile as bile salts, necessary for digestion of fats as noted in Chapter 4.

Man and other carnivorous animals such as the dog,

[63-2] [69-1] [96-7] may be fed large quantities of cholesterol without inducing changes in the arteries [33] [59-1] because they possess this efficient channel for excreting cholesterol in the bile. Such a mechanism is necessary because of the large amounts of animal fats naturally in the diet of these animals.

Herbivorous animals normally have no animal fats in the diet, so nature apparently saw no need to supply them with an efficient method either for digesting fat or excreting cholesterol. For this reason when cholesterol is fed to herbivorous animals, [63-2] [70-2] it builds up quite rapidly in the blood to fantastic heights and deposits itself in the walls of arteries, a process considered by some to be similar to that seen in human hardening of the arteries. [74-3]

In addition to cholesterol the blood contains natural fats, called triglycerides which, it will be recalled from Chapter 7, consist of three molecules of fatty acid bound to a central nucleus of glycerol. Fatty acids are of two types, saturated and unsaturated, depending upon the degree of their saturation with hydrogen. Plant fats and oils differ from animal fats not only in possessing no cholesterol, but also in being largely unsaturated.

Hardening of the arteries (arteriosclerosis) is caused by deposition of cholesterol and other fatlike substances on their walls. This causes a narrowing of the channel through the artery and a marked decrease in the amount of blood capable of flowing through it. The result is an insufficient supply of oxygen and other nutrients to the organ supplied by the artery. The heart is supplied by two major arteries called the coronary arteries. As coronary arteriosclerosis gradually develops the blood supply to the heart is progressively impaired, finally reaching a point where any load placed on the heart by exercise causes severe chest pain, called *angina pectoris*. If a coronary artery becomes plugged with a blood clot, the pain is greatly intensified and persistent. This is a "heart attack," also called coronary occlusion or coronary thrombosis.

With this brief synopsis of the cholesterol-fat-heart disease subject, the following scientific studies will doubtless be more meaningful.

Usually, in taking a dietary history, I will ask a patient, "How well do you manage the fats in your diet?"

His answer is often preceded by a thoughtful narrowing of the eyes. He is thinking: "This doctor is trying to trap me. He thinks I'm some sort of moron, not knowing about cholesterol and such stuff." This is usually proved by his cautious answer: "Oh, I eat no fat at all—I carefully trim every little bit of fat from my meat. I don't *like* fat!"

How did a large segment of our modern population become so firmly imbued with the conviction that fat is a dirty word? It all began about two decades ago, when studies of patients suffering from a certain type of heart disease (angina pectoris, coronary occlusion or thrombosis, myocardial infarction, ischemic heart disease, arteriosclerotic heart disease, and many other synonymous terms) often seemed to have abnormally high levels of cholesterol in their blood.

The following observations and assumptions were made:

1. Coronary heart disease is associated with high blood cholesterol.
2. Eating saturated animal fat raises the blood cholesterol.
3. Substituting unsaturated vegetable fat for animal fat will lower the blood cholesterol.
4. Therefore, replacing much of the animal fat with vegetable fats and oils will prevent coronary heart disease.

During the next twenty years controversial fat fed and kept bright the flame of cholesterol debate. Battle lines were drawn sharply between the two opposing camps. Proponents of the fat=heart disease formula industriously studied armies of cardiac patients and experimented on rabbits and pigeons. Their opponents also studied cardiac populations, experimented with different animals, and miraculously came up with opposite answers. Meanwhile the vegetable oil industries expanded processing plants and increased advertising budgets.

From both sides of the question bales of research reports, editorial comments, committee reports, letters to the editor, and abstracted rehash have been printed. Obviously this voluminous literature cannot be fully discussed in a book of this scope; therefore I will assume an author's pre-

rogative of reporting only some of the studies that tend to support a theme of this volume, that fat is a natural food for man and therefore it should not in any way be deleterious to him.

There are many theoretical reasons why fat should not harm humans. The first of these could be the veneration in which fat has been held throughout the centuries. An ancient proverb: "Eat butter first, and eat it last, and live till a hundred years be passed," reflects the attitude of our ancestors. [23] Ancient writings extol the pleasures of eating fat animals, fatty bone marrow, and the fatted calf. The fattest portion was always served to the guest of honor. Animal breeders of prehistoric Egypt developed a fat-tailed sheep, prized as a great delicacy. Even today a difference in fat content of meat will determine whether it will be graded "Prime" or merely "Good."

In any primitive society, fat is the most prized possession. It is the only food for which man will commit murder or revert to cannibalism. Sir George Hubert Wilkins [50] relates the macabre tale of fat-starved natives of the South Pacific being restrained from disinterring a dead baby for its body fat. After Napoleon's defeat fat-hungry Russian soldiers, roaming the streets of London, drank the whale oil from street lights instead of getting drunk on vodka or wine. [23] Stefansson has stated that 80% of a meal's calories must come from fat in order to appease the appetite; otherwise the individual will tend to over-eat protein or carbohydrate foods. Reports from many modern explorers [1] [10] indicate the intense fat hunger that appears when fat intake is markedly reduced, and the actual illness that follows elimination of fat from the diet has already been mentioned.

Any dietitian will attest that a fat-free diet is more difficult for a person to follow. My patient earlier in the chapter was not at all accurate when he said he "ate no fat at all." He forgot about the sour cream on baked potatoes, butter in the cream sauce, French-fried potatoes, fat in ice cream, pastries, soups, salad dressings, chocolate, nuts, the invisible fat in meats and innumerable other foods. Without fat, food becomes dry, tasteless and unappetizing.

A physician friend from England, visiting me during the

last year of the war, was asked what he would most desire I send him as a gift upon his return home. His unexpected request was not for sugar, or coffee, or alcohol, but for a chunk of bacon, the fatter the better. Fats were indeed impossible to purchase in England at that time and hunger for them was intense.

From what already has been said about man's natural foods, meat and fat, it seems inconsistent with nature that one of them—fat—could be harmful even if eaten in large amounts. Who was present during Pleistocene times to warn people that more than a small amount of fat would cause them to have heart attacks? From where would the supposed protective unsaturated plant oils come? Is it reasonable that these millions of prehistoric humans, who lived in all corners of the earth, who craved fat and ate it to the fullest extent, shortened their lives and jeopardized procreation of their species by inducing heart attacks in themselves? Has man undergone some sort of metabolic metamorphosis which has suddenly and universally robbed him of his ability to eat fat with safety? Can you think of any other animal to which nature has given a strong inclination to eat a food injurious to it? Would she be likely to play this scurvy trick on man alone?

Another most important aspect of the subject is the epidemiological study of various races compared with ethnically similar groups who have divergent fat-eating habits. A study was made of five hundred pairs of Irish brothers, [91-24] one of each pair having migrated to America while the other remained at home. Those remaining at home ate more animal fat and twice the butter the Americans ate, but had a much lower rate of heart attack. [106-4] [108-8] Navajo Indians, in general, eat the same high fat diet as other Americans, yet suffer only a fraction of the heart attacks. [106-4] A study of two thousand employed persons of middle age, [106-4] half of whom restricted fat intake, while the others ate high fat diets, revealed that subsequent heart attacks were divided almost equally between the two groups. The native Eskimo eats more fat in a day than the unrestricted American eats in a week, yet arteriosclerosis was unknown among them and heart attacks had not been de-

scribed prior to their recent introduction to white man's foods. [41] An interesting nomadic group, the Somali camel herdsmen, [65-1] [91-17] are reputed to eat over 350 grams of animal fat each day, yet studies reveal their blood cholesterol to be normal and no evidence of any sort was found to indicate disease of the heart or blood vessels. It should be remarked that eighty grams of fat, or less, is an average intake for Americans. Mongolians, [92-8] in spite of their large fat intake, have been shown to have normal blood cholesterol and freedom from arteriosclerosis. The Punjabis of North India eat from ten to twenty times the animal fat as do the South Indians, yet suffer only one-seventh as many heart attacks. [71-2] [92-11] The Masai tribe of Tanzania eat a characteristic high animal fat diet, yet are found to be singularly free of cardiovascular disease. [74-13] Vegetarian Trappist monks have a low blood cholesterol, but this does not protect them from heart disease, as shown by an identical incidence when compared to Benedictine monks, who eat a conventional diet with animal fats. [54-2] Swiss Alpinists, [54-2] eating a heavy animal fat diet, when compared to an ethnically identical group of persons who had moved to Basel, revealed that the rural group had a much lower blood cholesterol. Native Polynesians have an incidence of heart attacks three times that of Japanese living in Hawaii, [68-2] [90-1] even though the blood cholesterol and fat intake of the Polynesians are lower. Thailanders [54-1] eating an "atherogenic" diet rarely have atherosclerosis; Japanese consuming a "prudent" diet are commonly beset with this disease!

Clearly other factors besides the presence of animal fat in the diet must be operating to account for these atypical observations.

In addition to the epidemiological study of populations, which has just been touched upon, evidence pro and con in the cholesterol controversy includes experimental studies, involving both animals and human subjects. The fallacy of using non-human experimental subjects in studying human nutritional mechanisms has been noted repeatedly [8] [33] [74-3] [74-4] by workers in the field. The defect becomes all the more grievous if herbivorous animals are employed to

secure experimental results, intended to be applied to the cholesterol metabolism of carnivorous man. The chapter synopsis has alluded to several of these experimental incompatibilities. By far the greatest number of animal dietary experiments relating to human arteriosclerosis have been conducted upon herbivorous animals. A survey of the pertinent literature for the year 1963 reveals the following animals being used:

Fowl	26
Rat	30
Rabbit	69
Guinea pig	1
Hamster	1
Swine	2
Dog	5

One of the dog experiments related the inability to cause arteriosclerosis in this animal. The others reported creating the disease, but only after mutilation of the dog by destruction of thyroid activity or direct injury of the arteries.

Why this great preponderance of herbivorous animals in arteriosclerosis research? The obvious answer is that only the herbivorous animals, particularly the rabbit, [70-2] are susceptible to developing this disorder from feeding fat and cholesterol; carnivores, including man, are not. [59-1] [74-3]

It has been known for years that cholesterol fed to rabbits and guinea pigs in an amount causing arteriosclerosis is actually poisonous to these animals, [8] causing enlargement of the spleen and liver, abnormal bone marrow, and severe anemia. This same material is innocuous when fed in similar amounts to dogs and other carnivores. It is also well-known that feeding a high fat-cholesterol diet, which causes arteriosclerosis in birds, rabbits and other herbivores, is completely free of any similar effect when fed to unmutilated dogs. [96-7] Is it not reasonable to conclude that a similar diet would be similarly innocuous to another carnivore, man?

Furthermore, the normal blood cholesterol level of 30 in the rabbit must be increased 130-fold (to 4,000) before ar-

teriosclerosis is induced. If the other organs of such a treated rabbit are examined, a deposition of cholesterol similar to that in the blood vessels is found in the lymphatic system, the liver, digestive tract, and kidneys. [8] Thus it would seem that the cholesterol-saturated rabbit deposits its cholesterol willy-nilly among all tissues and organs, not specifically in the arteries alone. This fact shows the cholesterol-induced arteriosclerosis in the rabbit to be quite different from the specific arterial disease of humans. On the basis of rabbit experiments it would be equally logical to accuse cholesterol and fat of causing disease of the liver, kidneys, and the digestive tract.

Cholesterol feeding has never caused coronary thrombosis in an animal in spite of the severe damage it seems to accomplish in the larger blood vessels. [74-4]

Finally, even though the feeding of polyunsaturated fats is capable of lowering the cholesterol levels in experimental animals, it remains to be shown that this accomplishes any improvement in the cholesterol depositions in their arteries.

Obviously there are huge gaps in the evidence supplied by animal studies, which prevents its application to the human heart and artery disease.

Clinical studies (research performed on humans) are in many cases most difficult to interpret. One of the chief problems is, amazingly, a virtual inability to be certain a free living experimental subject is actually adhering to the diet or regimen prescribed. [91-22] Uncontrolled food and environmental factors always introduce variables into human studies, making the interpretation of results subject to error.

Another problem arises in the chemical determination of cholesterol itself. Analysis of identical blood samples often shows significant differences when repeatedly analyzed in different laboratories, or even within the same laboratory. Variations in the blood cholesterol are seen between individuals following eating, changes of position, alcohol, pregnancy, exercise, emotional stimuli, certain diseases, taking hormones, according to the season, or the age of the subject. [71-2] These variables seem to preclude any agreement on what the normal cholesterol level is for man; values from 150 to 350 are quoted as normal by various groups. This

swing in laboratory results is much greater than the changes in cholesterol levels secured by manipulation of the diet.

A large body of evidence exists that the blood level of cholesterol has no direct bearing on the presence or absence of arteriosclerosis and coronary artery disease in humans. [8] [89-1] Autopsy studies—the most specific method of determining the presence and degree of any abnormality—have failed to show a correlation between the presence of hardening of the arteries and the blood cholesterol that had been observed during life. In a four-and-a-half-year study of more than three thousand men, no significant difference in heart attacks was noted in those with high as compared with low cholesterol levels. A ten-year Australian study of eight hundred patients reported identical findings. [91-8] Swiss physicians compared one hundred patients with recent heart attacks with an equal number of "normals." [92-7] They found no difference in cholesterol levels between the two groups but did note a marked increase in blood cholesterol in those with heart attacks two months *after* the attack. This rise in cholesterol following coronary occlusion has been observed by others, and possibly explains variations in clinical findings of some studies. Observation of eight thousand New York men showed the occurrence of coronary heart disease and heart attacks not to depend in the slightest upon the blood level of cholesterol. [91-12]

It has been agreed that restriction of animal fats and feeding of unsaturated vegetable fats and oils is capable of lowering the blood cholesterol level somewhat in humans. It has not been shown, however, that lowering cholesterol by these means either prevents the development of arteriosclerosis in many, corrects it after it has occurred, or prevents future heart attacks. [74-10] The truth of this statement is proved by many researchers. Among these are a British study of 264 men who had suffered coronary heart attacks. [76-4] One-half of the group were then placed on a dietary regimen to lower serum cholesterol, while the remainder continued with a normal fat diet. While the cholesterol of the restricted group fell somewhat, the percentage of recurrent heart attacks in both groups was almost identical. Another study of coronary heart disease in England [84-1]

showed that serum cholesterol could be lowered by the use of corn oil in the diet, but survival rates for those with reduced cholesterol levels were poorer than for those making no changes in the diet who had unchanged cholesterol levels. [64-1] A Norwegian study of over sixteen thousand men, [74-19] two-thirds of whom received daily doses of unsaturated fatty acids (linseed or sunflower oil), found these measures failed to protect the individuals from coronary artery disease.

Specific medications, recently available, are capable of rapidly lowering the cholesterol levels in man, but beneficial effects in arteriosclerosis or coronary heart disease following their use have not been described. [74-19]

As recently as 1966, the Food and Drug Administration of the United States government, considering the evidence pro and con, ruled that manipulation of blood cholesterol levels through diet is not conclusively accepted by scientists as the best way to prevent, treat, or control heart or artery disease. [91-19] The Council on Foods and Nutrition of the American Medical Association states that there is no definitive proof that lowering serum cholesterol, or preventing a rise in serum cholesterol, will lower the morbidity and mortality associated with coronary heart disease. An Australian Heart Foundation spokesman [91-18] voices a similar attitude!

Nevertheless, the members of our National Diet-Heart Study remain steadfast in their insistence that the incidence of premature coronary heart disease is strongly associated with the blood cholesterol level, and that the blood cholesterol can be safely lowered by modification of the usual American diet. Now, after nearly two decades of research, they propose a further gigantic study involving 100,000 subjects [92-10] to find out if premature coronary heart disease can be prevented by diet!

Apparently the cholesterol theory still requires a great deal more proof, about five years and up to fifty million dollars' worth.

Science in the past has been riven by severe and bitter controversy. Almost invariably, when an armistice has been reached, the truth has been found to lie somewhere between

the opposing camps. In the present cholesterol controversy, a solution without dishonor to either side is possible.

If an unnatural food such as carbohydrate, and sugar in particular, were to be indicted as the dietary cause of heart disease and strokes, everyone would be happy—everyone, that is, except the sugar and vegetable oil industries, who would no longer have a market for their saccharine and oleagenous products.

The diet-heart disease advocates would be vindicated. Heart disease is linked to diet—only the advocates bet on the wrong horse!

At the same time the stigma of murder would be removed from an innocent and necessary human food substance—fat. Joy would reign in the hearts of the butter and egg people when they found their products were no longer toxic to their customers.

There is a growing mass of scientific evidence supporting such a concept.

The first discordant note in the cholesterol concerto was heard in 1961, [53-1] [76-2] when an Israeli physician reported his studies of two ethnically identical populations found in his country. The first group was composed of Yemenites, recently migrated to Israel. The second was Yemenites who had migrated to Israel at least twenty-five years previously. Study of their respective diets revealed that the fat eaten by Yemenites prior to migration was nearly all of animal origin. Their carbohydrate was chiefly starch, with only seven grams of sugar per day. The "old settlers" (Yemenites who had lived in Israel twenty-five years or more) had adopted the Western-type Israeli diet, with about the same amount of animal fat but with added vegetable fats, oils, and margarine. The carbohydrate calories were about the same as in the Yemenite diet but contained much more sugar—about sixty-three grams per day. Proteins eaten by both groups were about the same. When compared to Yemenites who had lived in Israel ten years or less, it was found that the old settlers were characterized by a much higher incidence of diabetes, high blood pressure, elevated cholesterol, and coronary heart disease. The only significant differences in diet of the two groups was the use of unsatu-

rated fat and much more sugar by the group showing increased heart disease.

Previous world-wide epidemiological studies, which had indicated increased use of fat to be the cause of cholesterol elevation, were reviewed, and it was noted that this increased use of fat by industrialized countries was always paralleled by an increased use of carbohydrate, [92-3] especially sugar! Such epidemiological evidence, while it did shake the foundation of the cholesterol theory, was not conclusive in convicting sugar, for it was also found that coronary heart disease occurs more frequently in individuals who wear shoes, use flush toilets, or have three telephones on their desks. Experimental evidence was obviously badly needed to get this exciting new fledgling theory off the ground.

Researchers next reported that a diet high in carbohydrate and low in fat had the paradoxical effect of elevating the blood's triglyceride (true fat) level and enhancing the deposition of fat in body cells. There was a simultaneous but purely coincidental and innocuous rise in the blood cholesterol (the fat-like substance). [60-1] [84-3] Similar complicated biochemical, experimental, and clinical studies began to pour in—all of which further exposed the role being played by the sly villain—sugar. [60-1] [60-5] [74-18] [78-1] [92-3]

Today it is well-accepted by an increasing number of scientists [74-22] [74-23] that elevated triglycerides is the most common significant abnormality in coronary heart disease, *not cholesterol*. [68-1] Further, it is accepted that both blood fat and cholesterol are *elevated* by dietary carbohydrate and *lowered* by fats in the diet, indeed a strange and contradictory situation which is nevertheless a fact. [84-2] If blood fat is reduced by a low carbohydrate diet, the blood cholesterol also falls somewhat. One can determine whether a patient is adhering to a low carbohydrate diet merely by observing his blood triglyceride level. [54-3] [74-11] [78-1] [91-11]

What a neat package this theory of arteriosclerosis makes! It explains many things and ties up the untidy loose ends of the cholesterol theory.

It explains why prehistoric man did not suffer from arteriosclerosis. He had no hardening of the arteries because he had no sugar to eat and very little carbohydrates of any sort. He did eat a lot of fat, however. Evidence of arteriosclerosis began to appear in the remains of those humans who had lived only after farming had become well-developed and had contributed large amounts of carbohydrates to man's diet. [23] Arteriosclerosis seems to be definitely tied up with civilization, as is also diabetes and hypertension, those first cousins to hardening of the arteries. [74-23]

As civilization developed, the use of carbohydrates grew disproportionately to that of fats and proteins. With the industrial era, foods became even more concentrated. Sugar and fats became indispensable. The modern era took center stage and more factors—the product of civilization plus nutritional fiddle-faddle—began to contribute their bit roles.

People became fat and lazy. They loaded up on vitamins, smoked too much, drank too much alcohol and coffee, and ate too much salt.

Their blood pressure went up and diabetes became a household word, because there was a diabetic in almost every house. Water supplies became purified to the point that magnesium, fluorine, zinc, cadmium, chromium, and other minerals were absent. The atmosphere became polluted. Doctors gave the same hormones to man and wife but for different reasons. All of these accompaniments of civilization have been blamed as contributing to the defectiveness of our arteries, yet through it all the consumption of sugar soared, and only a few noticed or seemed to care.

This new carbohydrate theory explains why fat-eating primitives such as the Masai, the Somalilanders, and the Mongolians escape the consequence of eating fat—their carbohydrate intake is very low. It explains why the Eskimo, contentedly gnawing his congealed blubber, seal meat, and frozen fish, has normal blood fat and cholesterol, while his children eating American foods at the government boarding school have high values. [66-1]

It even explains why the dog, resistant to most efforts at hardening his arteries, will develop arteriosclerosis if fed

scraps from his master's table which contain concentrated carbohydrate. [107-4]

Best of all, it removes the odium from animal fat, an honored food given us by nature, and transfers it to an unnatural substance, sugar, which much more justly deserves such a heinous reputation.

Let us see how this all falls into place by describing an actual case history. R.D., a somewhat overweight barber, consulted me recently because of abdominal pain. His physician had studied his problem conscientiously but could demonstrate no abnormality. A diagnosis of colitis had been made.

His pains were not typical of a functional digestive disturbance, but neither did they suggest an organic disease. My examination and review of bundles of X-ray film and laboratory reports offered no clue. I was tottering on the brink of a dilemma when the laboratory technician entered to report the results of a blood count taken earlier. I looked at the slip she handed me; all were normal!

She turned to leave, then ventured uncertainly, "Doctor, Mr. D's serum was very turbid."

"Hm-m-m," I replied. (This is a medical term, meaning "Well, I'll be damned.")

"Are you quite certain you are fasting? You've had nothing at all to eat since last night?" I queried the patient.

"No, nothing," he replied. "Why is that so important?"

"Simply that the milky appearance of your blood serum indicates a high level of fat. It shouldn't be that way unless you had recently eaten some fat," I explained. "Further study is necessary to determine the cause of this abnormality."

Mr. D. was placed on a very low fat diet and another test was done in two weeks. There was no significant change in his blood fat. His abdominal pains continued and he complained bitterly of a hunger for fats.

Next he was placed on a very strict low carbohydrate diet with an unlimited fat intake. Two weeks later he reported again. This time he was smiling.

"No more pains, Doc," he beamed. "Haven't felt this well for years. I've lost a few pounds of flab, too."

Laboratory tests revealed normal levels of blood fat.

R.D. had elevated blood fats induced by carbohydrates in his diet. As long as he avoids very much starch and all sugar he will be well, and atherosclerosis will be no threat to him.

Carbohydrate-induced hyper-triglyceridemia, as this condition is called, does certainly exist. But how prevalent is it? How important is its role in heart and artery disease? How is it related to diet?

The first clarification of the problem came when Fredrickson and Lees, of the Molecular Disease Laboratory of the National Institutes of Health, divided patients with the various types of hyperlipidemias into five groups, based upon their chemical patterns. Continued studies soon revealed that some of the groups were dependent upon fat in the diet while others were carbohydrate-dependent. [17]

Dr. Peter Kuo [74-18] [74-28] [90-3] found that more than 90% of 286 patients belonged in groups with elevated blood fat secondary to carbohydrate in the diet. His treatment was a drastic limitation of this dietary substance, especially sugars. No alteration of fats in the diet was attempted. With this single change in the diet, satisfactory control of the abnormally high blood fat was achieved. Dr. George Herman [71-2] studied 313 patients, finding 237 of them to be suffering from carbohydrate-induced hyperlipidemia. Of the remaining 76, 13 were found to have an hereditary cause for their abnormality, of a type not associated with cardiovascular disease at all. The other 63 were found to be fat-sensitive, but even these were benefited by carbohydrate restriction. Our patient, the overweight barber, belonged to this group (Type IV).

Dr. Leon Ostrander [71-1] believes that individuals who are overweight, have hyper-triglyceridemia with reduced sugar tolerance, and a predisposition to arteriosclerotic vascular disease, constitute a large segment of our population. Other students of the problem have strongly tended to indicate carbohydrates, particularly sugar, as the dominant dietary factor in elevating cholesterol and blood fat, with resulting arteriosclerotic heart disease. [53-1] [54-3] [64-2] [82-2] [84-2] [86-2] [91-6] [91-9] [91-11] [93-2] [104-1]

It is also believed that those cases of hyperlipidemia caused solely by fat in the diet (not in the slightest depen-

dent upon carbohydrate) rarely if ever develop arteriosclerosis. [71-2] [74-18]

To be sure, the last word on this cholesterol-fat-carbohydrate-triglyceride disputation has as yet not been said, [92-12] but the pendulum is swinging in increasing arcs toward exoneration of animal fats in the diet. [56-2] [74-30] [108-15]

The following updating of the relation of diet to heart disease seems warranted at this time:

1. Elevation of the blood fats, and not cholesterol, appears to be significantly associated with the development of arteriosclerosis and coronary heart disease.
2. Blood fats are usually elevated by dietary carbohydrates, especially sugar, and actually lowered by animal fat in the diet if sugars and starches are restricted.
3. Proof is still lacking that restriction of animal fat or the use of unsaturated vegetable oils in the diet will favorably influence arteriosclerosis or coronary heart disease.

One might be justified in questioning: would it not be wise to play safe by substituting unsaturated fat in the diet for some of the animal fats, pending settlement of the controversy? Such a course, whether beneficial or not, probably would not be harmful. The only problem is that it would leave the individual only half-safe, for it neglects entirely the baleful role that carbohydrates plays in the area of arterial disease and, in addition, allows them to wreak the havoc of functional and organic disease just described in previous chapters. So, to be sure, the proper diet would appear to be the low carbohydrate diet of Chapter 15, with substitution of unsaturated fat for some of the animal fats if desired.

The best advice? If your physician has prescribed a specific dietary regimen for your heart, by all means follow it carefully. If he has not, restrict both the animal fat and carbohydrate in your diet until this imbroglio between the Jack Spratts and the Jack Spratts' wives has been settled.

Meanwhile, might it not be wise to have hypertension and diabetes treated, reduce overweight to normal, stop smoking, and exercise prudently? All of these are important risk factors in the total care and treatment of your heart.

Chapter 20

FOOD AND ENERGY

Going on within this body of ours are literally hundreds of complicated biochemical and metabolic processes. Some of these are well understood but others remain unexplained, and the very existence of still others is doubtless unsuspected. In the past these unexplained and mysterious mechanisms were considered to be divine endowments, called "vital processes." While not in the least enlightening, such a concept served as a face-saving function to the pioneering scientists of a past era. Today, a scholarly science agrees that the intricate bodily reactions associated with life must all have definite chemical or physical reactions governing them, even though the precise natures of some are disputed, exist only in theory, or are still undiscovered.

One such disputed enigma of the past, recently clarified, is the mechanism by which the body transmutes food into muscular energy.

It is with almost monotonous regularity that patients, seen after being on a low carbohydrate diet for two or three weeks, will respond to the query, "Well, Mrs. Jones, how are you feeling?" with a woebegone, "Oh, Doctor, I am feeling much better in my abdomen, but—I'm so-o-o tired, simply exhausted."

With sly malice and a look intended to be one of astonishment I reply, "Tired? Now I wonder what in the world would cause you to feel tired."

Her patronizing rejoinder: "Well, you know, Doctor, I'm getting no sugar at all, and everyone knows that sugar is the energy food for the body. I'm just exhausted. Can hardly lift my hand or do my housework. My husband can tell you how weak I am. And I've lost weight, too!"

Her husband, who has had to do all the housework for three weeks and cook all of his own meals, looks at me hopefully. For a moment I am tempted to try to explain why she could not be tired because of the diet, but I catch the defiant gleam in her eye that tells me her mind is already made up and that nothing I can say will change it. I take the coward's way out and change the subject.

Mrs. Jones is not tired because she has no sugar in her diet, for she is actually getting an adequate amount of glucose from the protein and fat she eats (Chapter 7). Mrs. Jones is merely subconsciously seeking an honorable excuse to wheedle some sweetmeats from me to satisfy her craving for sugar.

She remembers a soft drink advertisement about "the pause that refreshes," that a candy bar is a "quick energy pick-up." There was that bulletin in the newspaper that sugar prevents fatigue, keeps drivers alert, and helps prevent automobile accidents. Mrs. Jones' faith in the bulletin might have been shaken had she noticed that it was sponsored by the Confectioners Association. It is via such subtle advertising that the Mr. and Mrs. Joneses of the world have become convinced that sugar is the energy food in the human diet, without which one runs out of steam, becomes tired, ineffective, and unable to perform satisfactorily. While not publicized by its makers for some reason, taking sugar away from people also seems to make them ill-tempered as well as tired.

To Mrs. Jones it seems common knowledge that sugar is the energy food. Therefore her assumption of "no sugar, no energy," seemed reasonable to her, so she became tired.

Mrs. Jones did not realize that her weight loss was the result of her own fat stores being mobilized to provide the very energy she denied having.

While there is little or no modern scientific opinion to support the role of carbohydrates as the energy food, there is

a great deal of evidence showing that carnivorous animals and man can maintain normal mental and physical performance with no carbohydrates at all in the diet. Much of this evidence has already been presented.

It is well-known that carnivorous animals on a meat-fat diet, even though confined to small pens or cages for long periods of time, seem to retain their vigor, strength, and endurance even though denied the opportunity to exercise. The meat-fed lion and tiger of zoo or circus retain their strength and ability to make prodigious leaps. Sled dogs of the North are customarily confined by leashes or in small kennels during the summer and fed nothing but meat and fish. When winter comes these animals are ready at once for arduous duty; they require no period of physical training or conditioning before being put into the traces for eight or twelve hours of grueling work. I have been told that hunting dogs maintained between seasons on meat and fat show this same retention of hard muscles, stamina, and vigor, even if put in the field directly from the kennels.

The Eskimo spends most of his time in practical inactivity during the winter, being confined in his snow-covered hut, eating meat, fish, and fat, rarely venturing outside. [7] In the spring he engages in strenuous hunting chores, travels many miles to hunting grounds, and plunges into these activities full bore with never a thought of physical rehabilitation or "getting into condition."

Hutton states that the Eskimo recoups his strength and energy with a much shorter period of sleep than do people on civilized diets, and is much more resistant to fatigue. [7] Dr. Clarence Lieb [74-1] studied patients on pure meat-fat diets, finding that a man could run one hundred yards in twelve seconds or swim five miles without fatigue even though no exercise was habitually taken and no conditioning or training of any sort had been employed.

In the late fall of 1895 two Norweigians, Fridtjof Nansen and Frederik Johnsen, landed on a northerly island of the Franz Joseph group. [77-1] They had with them European provisions to last a few weeks. Because of the abundant game (walrus and polar bear), they decided to save their provisions for the following summer, and from August until

the spring breakup of the Arctic winter they got no exercise, did not bathe or change clothes, remained in perfect health, and were able to do a full day of sledging without fatigue on their very first day of travel.

This ability of carnivorous animals and man to maintain muscular strength and stamina for long periods without exercise, if they eat only meat and fat, is a previously unpublicized phenomenon of low carbohydrate nutrition.

Rear Admiral Robert E. Peary [77-2] notes the ability of Arctic explorers to subsist for as long as a year with no food but pemmican twice daily. Men doing heavy work required two pounds of pemmican, corresponding to six pounds of steak and one pound of fat daily.

The carbohydrate-free energy diet works in places other than the Arctic. Native porters in Australia, who eat nothing but kangaroo meat, will carry heavy loads for as long as twelve hours without rest or refreshment. Their desert-dwelling cousin, the Australian aborigine, during a normal day's scouting for food, will lope steadily for a distance of twenty miles, interspersed with occasional bursts of speed to overtake a wounded or fleeing animal. [40] He accomplishes this on a handful of dried worms, bugs and insects, raw kangaroo meat, and an occasional unwary rodent.

These observations of carnivorous animals and primitive, as well as civilized man, demonstrate conclusively our ability to maintain strength, vigor, and stamina with no carbohydrate whatsoever in the diet.

In view of the widespread belief that sugar is the energy food, surprisingly few well-controlled experimental studies have been done on man or animal to prove this assumption. The only acceptable research I was able to find on athletic performance [74-8] failed to show any benefit as a result of feeding sugar.

If man were to get weak, tired, and ineffectual when the amount of sugar was reduced in his diet, he should be expected to become much weaker, more tired, and ineffectual if he received no food at all, that is, if he were starved. Under conditions of starvation the body is forced to maintain itself solely by means of the stored foods within itself, which are glucose and fat.

Glucose is stored by the body in small amounts only, while fat stores are considerable, amounting to 20% or more of the body weight. If man's muscular strength were dependent upon glucose alone, a fasting subject would rapidly deplete the small amount of this substance; he would quickly run out of fuel and become weak. However, if his muscles could utilize the much greater stores of fat for energy, he could go along with normal strength for a long time; in fact, as long as there was fat left on the body.

Let's see how man gets along under conditions of near- or total fasting.

Obese patients undergoing total fasting do not get weak, as many of them continue their daily work routine. A United States Army study [91-20] of performance by men restricted to five hundred calories per day (egg protein and sugar) revealed no decrease in their performance when compared to an unrestricted dietary regimen. During the period of caloric restriction the men lost an average of one pound daily. Biochemical evidence indicated that body fat—not glucose—had furnished the calories to make up the deficit in oral intake of food. Another study of 195 volunteers undergoing total fasting revealed only a slight decrease in work performance for the first week, with recovery to the pre-fasting level activity by the eighth day. [75-1] Prisoners of war, subsisting on near-starvation rations, accomplished amazing work feats during the last war, until the fat stores of their bodies had been almost completely used up. Religious people used to routinely fast for forty days without missing any of their priestly duties, and Buddhist monk Thich Tri Quang set some sort of record by surviving for one hundred days without food.

Animal studies of digestive function are not always applicable to man because of the widely differing structure and function of carnivorous and herbivorous alimentary tracts. Muscular function, however, is thought to be the same for both, which allows metabolic studies of lower animals to be applied to man.

One such carefully controlled animal study [91-14] revealed that feeding fasting animals with protein or glucose just before exercise did not increase performance, but when

fat was given there was a marked improvement in strength and endurance.

These and foregoing studies again prove that man can get along in good shape with no carbohydrate at all in his diet, in fact with no food at all, without getting weak, tired, and ineffectual.

There is recent biochemical evidence indicating the older belief—that glucose is the energy food for muscles—to be erroneous.

Early physiologists, studying the phenomenon of energy transference from food to muscular work, noted that when a muscle was exercised oxygen was consumed, carbon dioxide was liberated, and heat was produced. This was quite suggestive of another type of combustion with which scientists were familiar—the burning of wood—which also consumed oxygen, liberated carbon dioxide, and produced heat. For many decades it was assumed that the metabolic fires of the muscles were kept burning by a carbohydrate, probably glucose.

However, when later observation of intact animals and humans instead of isolated muscle strips was made, different results were noted. In the first place it was found that the relative amounts of oxygen used and carbon dioxide produced by the muscles depended upon the diet. If sugar was fed before exercise, the amount of oxygen used was the same as the carbon dioxide produced. If the subject fasted before exercise, which allowed only body fat to be used by the muscles, the amount of oxygen consumed was far more than the amount of carbon dioxide produced.

This ratio of oxygen used to carbon dioxide produced is called the Respiratory Quotient (R.Q.). It may be determined merely by measuring the amount of oxygen taken out of the inspired air and the amount of carbon dioxide added to that expired. When pure carbohydrate is being used by the muscles the R.Q. is 1.0; when fat alone is being used, the R.Q. is 0.7. Thus, if the R.Q. is determined during exercise, it may be ascertained whether the muscles are using carbohydrate (glucose) or fat for fuel.

It is now accepted that either glucose or fatty acids may be used by the muscles as a source of energy. [84-2] Both

these substances may participate in the so-called citric acid cycle of energy production. [33]

In plain language, what does this all mean?

Simply this: if glucose alone is presented to the muscle, it uses it. If fatty acid alone is presented to the muscles, it is similarly utilized. But if both glucose and fatty acid are presented simultaneously to the muscle, as in our modern diet, the glucose is burned preferentially, while the fatty acids are shunted to the fat stores of the body (obesity).

Fat contains nine calories of energy per gram and glucose has only four. A drastic restriction of carbohydrate in the diet will force muscles to use fat instead of glucose, thus making available to them over twice as much energy for each gram of nourishment delivered. One actually has more energy, not less, when carbohydrates are restricted in the diet.

Turning for a moment to the insect world, it is known that locusts, which burn fat for muscular energy, consume about 1% of their body weight for each hour they fly. The glucose-burning fruit fly consumes between 7% and 10% per hour of flight. [108-12] A modern jet airplane burns about 12% of its weight each hour in the air.

It is beginning to look more and more as if fat is an efficient fuel for muscular energy.

Now, utilizing what information we have gathered so far, it may be seen how nicely this all fits in with man's primitive diet of meat and fat; how poorly our present high carbohydrate mode of nutrition is suited not only to our digestive capabilities, but also to our biochemical and metabolic well-being.

It has been previously noted that the central nervous system and the red blood cells are the only tissues of the body that are strictly dependent upon glucose for continued functioning (Chapter 7). Primitive man secured this vital glucose from the proteins and fats of his diet. There was no other source! The glucose thus obtained was not an unlimited amount, to be sure. There was just enough to guarantee the continued health and functioning of his red blood cells and central nervous system. There was none to spare.

From time to time prehistoric man was required to fight

or flee for his life. His muscles then required large amounts of fuel. Had they been able to utilize only glucose from his limited stores, he would certainly have succumbed to fatigue when the glucose was expended. [60-1] His red blood cells would have stopped functioning and his central nervous system would have died in the process. He would have been caught but he already would have been killed.

The discovery that muscles work exceedingly well when given only fat thus explains how man survived in the first place. It also explains how the fasting athlete can expend his energies lavishly without threatening the integrity of his brain and nervous system; it explains the remarkable stamina of starved prisoners of war. It explains how modern primitive societies survive on modern Stone Age diets without suffering weakness or obesity. It explains why Mrs. Jones did not really get weak on her low carbohydrate diet. It scuttles the notion that carbohydrate is a necessary part of any carnivorous diet, and points out unerringly that there is really no good reason for it to be in our diet at all.

Points to ponder!

Consider the difficulty the human carnivore experiences in digesting most carbohydrates; think of the ranks of functional digestive cripples and the legions of those suffering from carbohydrate-induced organic diseases. Knowing that carbohydrate plays not even an insignificant role in carnivorous nutrition or human health and now, after learning that it is not the energy food for mankind, can you think of a single reason why this substance should constitute 75% of our foods today?

Chapter 21

WHAT ABOUT VITAMINS?

Nearly always, when I suggest that avoidance of raw fruits and vegetables and orange juice would benefit a patient's functional indigestion or diarrhea, the reaction is one of horrified surprise and an involuntary expostulation. "But Doctor, where then will I get my Vitamin C?"

Had I told her to avoid wild rose hips or Indian gooseberries, she would not have blinked an eye. You see, she had not been bombarded daily with all sorts of advertising copy about rose hips and gooseberries. She didn't know these things were twenty times more valuable as sources of Vitamin C than citrus, and that most of the Vitamin C of oranges is in the peel. So, she and the children had been getting along just fine without wild rose hips and Indian gooseberries, but certainly not without citrus.

Such an attitude toward citrus fruits implies a widespread belief that Vitamin C is not only the most important to nutrition and health of all the vitamins, but that there are only a few reliable sources for it. Several questions must be answered to get this vitamin into proper perspective in the picture of modern nutrition.

First, are raw fruits, vegetables, and juices, or vegetable material of any sort for that matter, necessary to avoid scurvy, the Vitamin C deficiency disease? Is Vitamin C destroyed by normal cooking? Is Vitamin C of great value, or

any value at all, in preventing or treating colds and other infections? Finally, must Vitamin C pills ever be taken by people eating an average diet, even though no raw stuff, citrus, juices, or milk are consumed?

The first of these questions may be answered in the negative on philosophical grounds alone, for we have seen that prehistoric man for many millenniums ate no raw plant material of any sort. Even had he eaten it he could not have digested it, and therefore he would have gained no vitamin or nutritional benefit as a result. Nor has the passage of twenty thousand years changed the picture for, even today the modern Stone Age cultures described in Chapter 12 exist without fresh vegetables, fruits, citrus, or scurvy. Earliest observations of the Athapascans (Forest Indians of Northern Canada) revealed no trace of scurvy or other vitamin deficiencies. Bishop Reeves, [7] who later described both scurvy and rickets among these folk, attributed appearance of these diseases to recent use of bread and sugar, as well as the salt preservation of meat and fish. Others have also indicted salt preservation of meat as a chief cause of this deficiency disease.

Army rations during the Civil War consisted of salt pork or beef,hardtack or corn pone, and dried beans. [91-5] Fresh potatoes were supposedly supplied once weekly, but problems of transportation usually disrupted this schedule. Many soldiers, both Union and Confederate, died of scurvy. Others, able to forage the countryside for eggs, fresh meat, or fowl, to supplement their dried beans and hardtack, survived. Scurvy was probably first studied as it appeared among seafaring men of past centuries, whose diet was characteristically salt beef and sea biscuit. The disease commonly appeared among sailors when voyages lasted more than four months between ports of call. The ship's officers rarely suffered from scurvy, for they usually carried with them stores of cheese and live animals capable of furnishing limited rations of eggs, milk, fresh meat, and fat.

The time-honored remedy, lime juice, could not have been curative because it was stored for long periods and rapidly became putrid, both processes being fatal to preservation of any Vitamin C content. Scurvy was not uncommon

among personnel, both white and Indian, of the Hudson's Bay trading posts after the use of salted meat and fish began. [96-1] The disease was unknown among those eating nothing but game or pemmican. [77-2]

In 1898, my father joined the rush of prospectors to Alaska. Years later he told me of the frequency with which these gold-seekers succumbed to scurvy while eating only their civilized foods: bacon, beans, flour, sugar, and coffee. Potatoes in those days were the standard anti-scorbutic. When the potatoes ran out, scurvy followed shortly. It is peculiar that while these white men were dying of scurvy, the natives in the same area lived contentedly on their usual diet of game, without scurvy or potatoes.

Scurvy is both prevented and cured by eating fresh meat and fat. Many documented experiences prove this statement. In 1630, eight Englishmen were inadvertently abandoned on Spitzbergen without food. [77-1] They lived on game and were in good health when rescued nearly a year later. It is believed that scurvy appears after about four months on a diet free of Vitamin C.

In view of this experience of the Englishmen, a Dutch expedition was encouraged to winter two groups, one on Spitzbergen and one on the island of Jan Mayen. [77-1] It was their belief that if Englishmen could survive an Arctic winter with no food but game, Dutchmen could survive longer and in better condition if they were "well fed." Both groups of the Dutch expedition took along material for baking bread, whole cereals for porridge, cheese, alcohol, beer, sauerkraut, and pickles, the latter two items supposedly being anti-scorbutic. In addition, they took with them all of the remedies popular for scurvy in those days. The Spitzbergen group lived on good European foods alone, securing no game. The first member of this group died in four months, the remainder within another month. The Jan Mayen group secured two polar bears and lived twice as long, the first man dying after eight months and the others soon after. None of these men even suspected that the plentiful game available could be superior to their civilized foods, and they paid for this ignorance with their lives.

Four Russian explorers were accidentally left behind on

Spitzbergen in 1743. [77-1] They had practically no provisions and lived solely on game secured with improvised, primitive weapons. Six years and three months later the group was picked up in good health except for one who had sickened and finally died after five years of invalidism, obviously not a victim of scurvy.

Six Russian priests together with a young manservant arrived in the Arctic in the [23] fall. During the subsequent winter the six, because of religious vows, ate none of the fresh meat available, subsisting only on salted fish. All six mysteriously succumbed and had been buried by the following spring. The manservant, not being similarly monastically motivated, partook of the reindeer meat available and survived without difficulty.

Survival of man on a diet of fresh game works in the Antarctic as well as at the North Pole. Six men of Scott's Antarctic polar expedition were forced to subsist one entire winter on seal and penguin flesh plus an occasional minute ration of carefully hoarded "civilized foods." [35] The best summary of their experience while on this diet is in the words of Lieutenant Campbell's diary: "We have been all this month without biscuit and have felt none the worse, so evidently a seal meat and blubber diet is healthy enough. Strangely enough we *do not get tired of it*.*

It would be redundant as well as boring to recount the many other odds and ends of evidence to further support the conclusion that man can avoid scurvy by eating fresh meat. Whether he supplements meat with other foods seems to be immaterial. It is not necessary to eat this meat raw, nor is it mandatory that the whole animal be consumed, since steaks and roasts appear to be as effectively anti-scorbutic as are the viscera, adrenal glands, liver, kidneys, or blood.

It is of some interest to reconcile this point of view with the widely held belief that meat contains little or no Vitamin C. This substance, also called cevitamic or ascorbic acid, was first recognized in 1919 by an Englishman, was identified in 1928 by a Hungarian, and was synthesized by a

* Italics by the author.

Polish chemist. In 1939, Dr. Mary Schwartz Rose opined that there was little or no Vitamin C in lean meat or liver and what was present would be destroyed by cooking. This conviction was founded on the feeding of meat to the guinea pig. [96-1] From what has gone before it is, I hope, obvious to the reader that the only valid conclusion to be drawn from this investigation would be that meat is not anti-scorbutic to the guinea pig, which never eats it anyhow. It was unfortunate that Dr. Rose did not try the same experiment on man but she didn't, and even today a respected biochemical textbook completely omits meat as a source of Vitamin C.

Whether meat contains more Vitamin C than is believed by nutritionists, if scurvy is not a deficiency disease at all, or if the human has an unsuspected ability to synthesize the vitamin, remains to be determined. It will suffice at this time to know that if man eats cooked fresh meat in average quantities, he need not live in fear of scurvy, even though he abjures the digestive mayhem inherent in eating of the modern "best sources" of this vitamin.

Vitamin C is one of the most sensitive to destruction by heat. Nevertheless, ordinary cooking destroys remarkably little of this vitamin. [6] A baked potato retains 80% of its Vitamin C, cooked peas 60-70%, baked yam 100%, and commercially canned fruits and vegetables 55-96%. It is interesting that a boiled carrot retains 90% of its Vitamin C but only 60% when raw, as it is shredded for salad. Authorities are in general agreement that peeling, storage and shredding destroy more Vitamin C than does cooking or canning. [25] Thus commercial canning of vegetable material, which is harvested at the peak of ripeness and promptly processed, probably affords a better source of Vitamin C, as well as the others, than does most fresh produce. [108-11]

Another widespread notion held by Americans is the belief that Vitamin C is of great value in cure and prevention of cold, pyorrhea, and other bacterial and viral diseases and infections.

Oddly, Vitamin A started out as the anti-infective vitamin, but a few years ago, for some undisclosed reason, people began taking Vitamin C for this purpose. It might be of in-

terest to recreate a hypothetical situation to explain this switch.

About ten years ago, let us say, two young men were taking an inventory of the chemicals stored in the basement of one of the smaller drug manufacturing firms. They had completed the tally when one of them turned for a last survey of the storeroom. He rapidly rifled through the sheets on his clipboard, turned to his partner, and said, "What's with the barrels in the corner? Must be twenty of 'em and they don't seem to be on the inventory sheets for last year at all."

The other approached the barrels, rubbed some dust and cobwebs from the head of one, and laboriously read: "Says 'C-E-V-I-T-A-M-I-C acid.' What's this stuff for, anyhow? Looks like it's been here for a long time."

"Dunno," replied the first young man.

Twenty barrels of cevitamic acid were added to the inventory list handed to the warehouse foreman at quitting time.

A few days later the warehouse foreman went to the manager, saying with an air of discovery, "Found we got twenty barrels of cevitamic acid in the basement. What is that stuff? Hasn't been touched in years. Seems like we should do something to get rid of it."

The manager thought for a moment and replied, "cevitamic acid? Oh yeah, it's an anti-oxidant. We sold a lot of it to people when they used to freeze fruits and vegetables at home. Keeps the fruit from turning black or something like that. Nobody freezes their own stuff any more so there's not much call for it."

At the weekly conference of department heads the manager duly reported he had found twenty barrels of cevitamic acid in the basement. He looked meaningfully at the sales manager and said, "Haven't sold a pound of the stuff in ten years."

The sales manager dispatched a memo to the research director, who in turn called a meeting of the research staff.

The research director rose, surveyed his staff of four young men, and announced, "Some wise guy got to poking around in the basement and found twenty barrels of

cevitamic acid that have been there for eight or ten years. The brass is sort of hot under the collar that it hasn't been sold. You guys get busy and find out what it's good for and let me know, so I can take it up with the chairman of the board."

The research director, who was brother-in-law to the chairman, turned at the door. "I'll do my best to get a nice bonus for the guy that comes up with something." He hurried off to his pre-luncheon martinis and thought no more about it. His bonus had been already fixed at a family conclave between his wife and the chairman, so there was no good reason for him to worry about twenty barrels of cavitamic acid that hadn't been sold. Besides, he was getting a little shaky. Must be low blood sugar. Oh well, a couple of martinis would fix that.

The underlings of the research staff departed in four directions. One went to the laboratory and began trying to metamorphize cavitamic acid into automobile tires, or perfume, or a new plastic—anything that might show up. Another, because of its sweetish taste, thought cavitamic acid might work well in a soft drink. The third went to lunch. He sat at an isolated table in a corner. He ordered four beers and a Swiss on rye, which he didn't eat. After all, he was engaged to the chairman's youngest daughter. He really didn't need the bonus. The bride's family paid for the wedding and after that he would have no problems. He sat and thought, or perhaps it would be better to say he dreamed.

But the fourth junior biochemist, our hero, went first to the library where he read all about cavitamic acid and even perused the *Index Medicus*. After a week of discouraging search one day his heart gave a great surge, for there before him, in a 1955 journal, [61-1] was the glamorous notation: "Acid, cavitamic, use in upper respiratory infections." He hurriedly procured the proper journal, looked up the article, glanced through it quickly and muttered disappointedly, "Nuts, this article is about Vitamin C. There must be some mistake in the reference."

But there was no mistake in the reference. In a footnote he found that cavitamic acid was really Vitamin C. Gradu-

ally the enormity of his discovery broke over him. The article reported Vitamin C to have amazing abilities to prevent penetration of the membrane of the nose and throat by bacteria and viruses.

The fourth assistant to the research director sat limply, his vacant eyes staring into space. "Holy Toledo, this is it! A cure for the common cold, with prevention yet. We got twenty barrels of the stuff. WOW!"

The report was duly made to the research director, who duly passed it on as his own discovery to the sales manager, who hastily summoned his field representatives to a top level conference. The field representatives did their job well, and by the time the pill-making machines had been switched from penicillin to cevitamic acid, the drug store windows were displaying multi-colored banners proclaiming it to be the "cold season." "Come in and get your prevention today! Vitamin C tablets now available, bottle of 100 for \$1.00." This tots up to almost \$200 per pound for cevitamic acid, an anti-oxidant which had formerly been sold to home freezers for a few cents an ounce.

Denial of the Utopian state of respiratory affairs began to appear in the medical journals. Careful study failed to confirm any benefit from taking Vitamin C pills for colds, pyorrhea, or any other infection. [64-3] Studies of industrial populations showed not the slightest difference in time losses of employees due to colds, whether they took Vitamin C tablets or placebos (dummy pills). [74-2]

But very few citizens read medical journals. The cat was irretrievably out of the bag and has never been recaptured and put away. People still dutifully purchase their bottles of Vitamin C pills when the frost appears on the pumpkin and the banners go up in the drugstore windows.

Merchandisers flex their muscles and the people pay tribute!

Well, so much for Vitamin C. How about the others?

If one examines the following table, a curious fact will be seen. It is agreed that there is no firm unanimity of opinion among all authorities concerning this material, but the data presented are the consensus of most. [29] [88-6]

<u>Vitamin</u>	<u>Present in Animal Fat-Protein</u>	<u>Synthesized by the Body</u>
A	Yes	Yes
B ₁ (thiamine)	Yes	No
B ₂ (riboflavin)	Yes	No (?)
NIACIN	Yes	Yes
B ₆ (pyridoxine)	Yes	Yes
PANTOTHENIC ACID	Yes	No (?)
BIOTIN	Yes	Yes
FOLIC ACID	Yes	Yes
B ₁₂	Yes	Yes (?)
C	No (?)	No (?)
D	Yes	Yes
E	Yes	No
K	No	Yes

Except for Vitamin C, which has already been discussed, every other known vitamin is present in animal proteins or fat, or can be synthesized by the human body. This fact by itself would strongly suggest that persons on a low carbohydrate diet need not search further for optimum vitamin sources.

Is it possible that, by being ultrascientific in selecting our diet with an intent to increase vitamin intake, we accomplish more harm than good? For instance, it is generally believed by most scientists, but not necessarily all nutritionists, that vegetable carotene, which is poorly absorbed by the human and which must be converted to Vitamin A before it is of any value, is distinctly inferior to pre-formed Vitamin A from animal fat and fish liver oils. Is it possible

that by emphasizing carotene-rich yellow and green vegetables in the diet we are tending to exclude the natural source of Vitamin A to the human, animal fat? Is it beneficial to human nutrition when we substitute a poor vitamin source for a good one? It is certain that prehistoric man ate no carotene-containing vegetation and often had no access to salt water fishes' liver, yet suffered no deficiencies. Animal fat must have been sufficient for his Vitamin A needs.

It is well-known that a high carbohydrate intake greatly increases the body's need for thiamine, and that increased dietary protein and fat markedly decreases this need. Jolliffe believes the increased need for thiamine today to be caused by the greatly increased consumption of sugar. [6] Is this bad effect from carbohydrate because it virtually crowds vital protein from the diet? Is this the reason beri-beri afflicts eaters of protein-poor polished rice and spares those consuming a less refined diet, which nevertheless has no greater content of Vitamin B₁? Is beri-beri a protein deficiency disease rather than one due to a vitamin deficit? When compressed or brewers' yeast is ingested, the Vitamin B₁ and other nutrients are not yielded up by this living organism as it passes through the digestive tract. [6] One really cannot blame this lowly organism for retaining its own vitamins and nutrients for its own use. However, such a penurious attitude on its part prevents the human body from gaining any advantage from ingesting yeast. In spite of this, thousands of people daily swallow quantities of live yeast organisms with the idea that they are making themselves healthy.

An adequate protein intake insures normal riboflavin and nicotinic acid (niacin) retention. Large doses of thiamine, however, may cause a relative deficiency of both, while a high fat intake lessens the body's need for the latter.

Dr. J. F. Brock [60-3] has pointed out that pellagra, an early century vitamin deficiency caused by excessive use of corn, would, if seen today, be called *kwashiorkor*, a protein deficiency (Chapter 18). Corn is deficient in tryptophan, one of the essential amino acids, which in turn is the precursor for niacin, which is the "vitamin" which cures pellagra. [88-6] Is pellagra a vitamin or protein deficiency disease?

In 1940 Jolliffe and Spies reported successful treatment of paralysis agitans by giving pyridoxine, but either the character of this vitamin or the disease itself has changed, for pyridoxine no longer is effective. Strange?

Folic acid will cure a certain type of nutritional anemia, but will also correct the blood abnormality of pernicious anemia without preventing degeneration of the spinal cord seen in the latter disease. An unclassified anemia should never be treated by folic acid for this reason.

Strict vegetarians are prone to develop Vitamin B₁₂ deficiencies, which raises some doubt as to the ability of the human body to synthesize this substance. Others suggest the body's failure in this type of patient might be the result of altered intestinal bacterial flora caused by an excess of carbohydrates and a deficit of animal proteins in a strict vegetarian diet. Does the vegetarian develop this deficiency because he cannot synthesize the vitamin or because he does not, as in pellagra, receive enough protein in the diet? The carnivorous aborigine does not develop this deficiency.

Scurvy, a Vitamin C deficiency disease, is cured [22] by feeding lean meat, which supposedly contains no Vitamin C. Why does preserving this same meat with salt apparently rob it of its anti-scorbutic and pellagra-preventing properties, while preservation in the form of pemmican does not? Is this because salting eliminates some anti-deficiency principle in the meat, or because certain essential amino acids are destroyed, making the meat an incomplete protein?

Rickets, as shown by examination of skeletal remains, first appeared during food-producing times, yet the sun (source of all Vitamin D) shone on the carbohydrate-eating Neolithic children no less than on carnivorous Paleolithic offspring, who remained free of the disorder. [23]

Absorption of fat-soluble vitamins (A, D, E, K) is greatly decreased by a lack of fat in the diet. Unsaturated fats have been shown to precipitate Vitamin E deficiencies, but this is probably of little importance, since it has never been shown that a complete absence of Vitamin E causes any recognizable vitamin deficiency state anyhow. However, rancid unsaturated fats destroy Vitamins A and B complex as well, which might sound a note of warning against the too en-

thusiastic use of low animal fat and increased polyunsaturates in the modern diet.

Yet another factor (Gontzea and Sutzescu), [25] incompletely studied at this time, is the alleged presence of anti-vitamin and anti-mineral substances in common human foods. These substances seem to have the ability to destroy their own vitamins, but much more important, they can also cancel the effect of vitamins and minerals contained in other foods eaten with them. An anti-vitamin C is found in cabbage, cucumber, pumpkin, cauliflower, banana, apple, and most of the common salad greens—the very foods touted for their vitamin C content. An anti-thiamine material is found concentrated largely in the entrails of some fishes. Fish flour, made of the whole fish, might contain significant amounts of this B₁ destroyer, thus limiting its nutritional usefulness.

Maize appears to harbor an anti-niacin factor, for it is well-known that large amounts of maize in the diet will cause pellagra in dogs, even though adequate amounts of niacin are present in other foods eaten simultaneously. Strongly suspected is an anti-pyridoxine material in linseed oil meal and flour—substances receiving increasing emphasis as possible human foods.

Two acids, phytic and oxalic, which are found in a wide variety of plant foods ranging from succulents to cereals, depress greatly the utilization of minerals, chiefly calcium, but also including iron, magnesium, zinc, phosphorous and iodine. The phytic acid contained in cereal grain is capable of causing rickets in young pigs and dogs whose diet contains a disproportionate amount of cereal. Might the consumption of cereal grain by Neolithic children have caused the appearance of rickets, a condition unknown in Paleolithic children who did not eat cereal?

These and many other unanswered questions suggest that the last chapter of the vitamin story is yet to be told, as is the controversy over how much fat and what sort is to be used in the human diet.

It has been shown that losses of thiamine and ascorbic acid, the two most sensitive to destruction by heat, is not great in properly cooked or canned fruit and vegetables. In-

activation of the remaining vitamins is even less. Therefore, the current tendency to consider raw fruits, vegetables and juices as "must" sources of any vitamin is not founded on a scientific or sound nutritional base. If this raw stuff is of no value as a vitamin source, what is it good for?

All this furore about vitamins would probably be pointless were vitamins unlimited perfectly innocuous. However, in addition to creating relative deficiencies as noted, some of these substances in excess are actually toxic.

Vitamins may be divided into two classes: those soluble in fat (A, D, E, K), and those that may be dissolved in water (B complex and C). All vitamins are stored in various tissues of the body. When the storage depots for the water-soluble vitamins are filled, any excess ingested will be excreted by the body, usually the kidneys. When an individual takes a high-potency vitamin capsule and shortly thereafter notices the urine become bright yellow with an opalescent brilliance and yeasty odor, he should be aware of two things. His vitamin storage depots are filled to the limit, and he can observe what happens to his vitamin dollar.

Even though these water-soluble vitamins are usually non-toxic, a mild over-dosage in infants with Vitamin C may cause restlessness, insomnia and diarrhea. An increased need for Vitamin C in infants born of mothers who chronically overdose with this vitamin during pregnancy has been reported.

Since there appears to be no mechanism for the excretion of the excessive intake of the fat-soluble vitamins, these substances may accumulate in the body and cause toxic reactions. Excess Vitamin A is said to cause loss of appetite, headache, diarrhea, muscular cramps, itchy skin, anemia, and peeling of the skin. [74-20] Too much Vitamin D has more profound effects, particularly in children, resulting in excessive deposition of calcium in their tissues. This causes abnormal hardening of the bones, interfering with growth, calcification of soft tissues including the arteries and, in some cases, mental retardation. [82-1] When given to pregnant women too freely, [60-4] Vitamin D has been known to cause narrowing of the great artery from the heart, calcification of the kidneys, elf-like visage, and mental retardation.

[102-1] in the offspring. In adults excessive Vitamin D [87-1] [91-27] causes weakness, elevation of blood cholesterol, gastrointestinal disorders, an increased need for magnesium in the diet and, somewhat wistfully it is said by old men, an aphrodisiac effect.

For these reasons it has been said that routine ingestion of vitamins is as likely to cause as many health hazards as it corrects!

How many Americans would you guess are really vitamin-deficient?

According to one study [88-6], 60% of teenage students in Syracuse were low in Vitamin C. This was attributed to the bizarre nature of teenage food choices. Yet teenage foods, even though unconventional to adult tastes, nevertheless contain adequate amounts of food modern dietitians consider to be good sources of Vitamin C. Why, then, are these teenagers Vitamin C deficient? Or are they, really? About 10% of junior high school girls in Vermont were deficient in thiamine. A group of 120 adult *patients*—a poor choice of subjects from which to expect normal values—showed 59% to be low in two or more vitamins (thiamine, folic acid, nicotinic acid, or pyridoxine). Conclusions from this study depended upon methods for vitamin assay which are frequently inaccurate, as well as lack of a universally accepted standard of what the normal value for each vitamin actually is.

Of great practical importance is the fact that the supposedly vitamin-deficient students were not, in any sense, ill. They played football, dated, studied and passed examinations, married, and had children. Which is the more valid criterion of vitamin deficiency—a figure representing an estimate of how many vitamins an individual has circulating in his blood, or the manner in which he performs, behaves, and feels?

People such as these are put into a gray, mystical classification called the *subclinical vitamin deficiency*. [47] If vitamins were purchased only for those having a definite vitamin deficiency disease, the needs of the nation could be met by a single small vitamin factory. But the concept of subclinical vitamin deficiency is a dandy maneuver to induce well

people to take vitamins. The subclinical vitamin-deficient are thus the grist for the vitamin merchant's mill. They are legitimate prey for the cadaverous model of video screen and magazine page, who points a finger and in effect says, "You might be feeling all right now, but you're going to be sick if you don't start taking . . ." So, the tired mother, the harried businessman, the depressed oldster, and the neurotic spinster go right out and buy some super-potent multiple vitamin capsules, and take double the recommended dose to get fast results. The nation is studded with huge vitamin factories, most of them working a night shift to keep pace with the demand.

What is the unbiased opinion of those interested in vitamin and nutritional supplements who have no financial axe to grind? As one source says, [47] "This nation's consumers would be no worse off nutritionally or physically if most of the four hundred million dollars spent each year on vitamin products were left in their bank accounts." The Federal Trade Commission states its finding that less than 1% of the American population are vitamin-deficient. [74-9] Most vitamin deficiencies that are seen in this country are among alcoholics, chronically ill individuals with suboptimal general nutrition, food faddists, mental patients, hippies, patients with digestive tract abnormalities which prevent absorption of nutriments, or in extremely poor and underprivileged families.

The United States Food and Drug Administration in 1966 proposed a statement: [74-12] "Vitamins and minerals are supplied in abundant amounts by the foods we eat. Except for persons with special medical needs, there is no scientific basis for recommending routine use of dietary supplements." While attacked en masse by concerned commercial interests, reaffirmation of this stand was taken by the F.D.A. in 1967 with the intention of submitting the recommendation to legislation.

Now, to answer the question: "Must vitamin pills ever be taken by people eating an average diet, even though no raw stuff, citrus, juices or milk are consumed?" the answer, to be sure, must be yes.

The categories of nutritional cripples just mentioned will

probably be benefited by vitamins, either orally or by injection. An infant reared in a sunless dungeon will probably require Vitamin D. The patient with pernicious anemia must have Vitamin B₁₂ in a form he can absorb. The patient with tropical sprue will be cured with folic acid. There are doubtless other rare conditions requiring vitamin supplementation. But as a rule, unless a physician specifically prescribes vitamins as treatment for specific vitamin deficiency states, you will be best served by avoiding them.

Those with deficient food intake but without disease will be cured most expeditiously by adding adequate amounts of animal protein and fat to the diet.

This has been a confusing chapter to the reader, I am sure. It is confusing to me also, and even more so to the thoughtful nutritionist who is more aware of how much there is to be confused about.

Until much more commercial propaganda has been neutralized by a great deal more scientific investigation, I will advise people to follow the course of nature, and eat as did prehistoric man—getting your vitamins as he did from the animal proteins and fat nature intended for our bill of fare.

Chapter 22

MALNUTRITION—PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE

Malnutrition is of two sorts. The first is an insufficiency of food of any kind. This is called total caloric malnutrition. The second is caused by deficiency of some component of the diet, even though ample total calories are present. This type of malnutrition is named for the substance missing or in short supply, such as the protein caloric malnutrition caused by not enough animal protein in the diet. Malnutrition caused by a carbohydrate deficit has never been described and, since fat may be synthesized from either protein or carbohydrate, fat caloric malnutrition is either extremely rare or does not occur at all.

During the Old Stone Age, small groups of humans were scattered over the face of the earth. Large herbivorous animals roamed the lush vastness of tropical and temperate zones. They were always accompanied by carnivorous predators, including man, which served as the only check on their unlimited multiplication. Thus, during the Paleolithic era, there were only a few humans and there was a superabundance of food animals for both man and his competitors, the four-footed carnivores. There was no deficit of total calories or protein for either man or beast.

Then came the Middle Stone Age, the Mesolithic, the climatic changes which caused the gradual disappearance of

the great game herds. Man was forced to compete with carnivorous beasts for food. The animals were more effective hunters than the human, who found himself largely dependent upon small animals, which were difficult to catch and didn't go very far toward feeding his family. Even with increasingly sophisticated weapons, man found himself hungry more and more often. During this period, man's nutritional pattern was still nothing but protein and fat, which was fine; there just wasn't quite enough of it. Thus, during the Mesolithic era, there was a mild caloric deficit but no shortage of protein. There was some hunger but no malnutrition.

Hunger, but not malnutrition, stimulated man to search for new food sources and ushered in the New Stone Age, the Neolithic or the Age of Farming. Man increased his foods in two ways; first, he domesticated the larger herbivorous animals, and second, he introduced cultivated carbohydrates into his diet. With better weapons and more skill in using them, man continued to eat game animals, which still comprised a major portion of his food.

Nobody bothered to take a world-wide census in 8000 B.C.; consequently we can only guess at the Neolithic population; it was probably about five million. Only a modest agricultural industry was able to erase hunger from this small human assemblage. By the time of Christ, even after the world's inhabitants had multiplied fiftyfold to 250 million, man was still eating adequate proteins and fats with enough carbohydrate thrown in to prevent hunger. Therefore, during the Neolithic era, man's diet was again balanced; there was abundant protein and fat and no deficit of total calories. There was no hunger and everybody was happy.

But at this point in the story we are still about two thousand years from the present.

The world population continued to increase at an ever faster tempo. The need for food became greater and greater. It was soon found that increasing the yield of domestic animal protein was a slow and expensive process. Game animals became less numerous and there were fewer hunters among the urbanites. Carbohydrate foods could be doubled in a single year by merely plowing up twice as much acreage, and there was always abundant acreage to be plowed up, so

the use of cheap and plentiful carbohydrates soared, and that of the scantier and more expensive animal proteins decreased proportionately. Among the poor of the Industrial Age, protein caloric malnutrition began to appear for the first time in the history of mankind.

This trend of more carbohydrate and less protein and fat in the human diet has not changed but has grown steadily, reaching an almost intolerable overbalance in the closing years of our twentieth century.

Today, malnutrition exists in both its forms. In some areas there is total caloric malnutrition. People are not only hungry—they are starving. In other areas there are copious total calories but a shortage of animal proteins. These people are not starving or even hungry. Some are obese, but they suffer from protein caloric malnutrition nevertheless.

First, let us examine the case of the hungry populations. This sort of malnutrition is seen in the poorer undeveloped nations—overpopulated, uneducated, and with minimal industrialization or agricultural expertise. Today, right now, millions are starving in Asia, not from lack of an optimum diet but from lack of food of any sort. [106-7] If present trends continue, similar conditions will prevail in Africa in ten years and in Latin America in twenty. Dr. B. R. Sen, Director General of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, estimates that 15% of mankind is hungry. [91-13] [108-4] About half of the world population resides in the Far East, yet this area consumes only one-fourth of the world's food supply. In 1966 India suffered a drought, and the following year required a million tons of food (600 ship-loads) to forestall mass starvation. [88-10] For the first time in many years, the United States finds its stock of surplus grains and foodstuffs depleted to a minimum level, and has discontinued paying farmers not to raise wheat.

While a deficit of total calories is uncomfortable to the individual who is hungry, it poses no great threat to humanity. The starved person either dies or gets something to eat and recovers; in either case he does not become a burden to society. Quite different is our second type of malnutrition—protein caloric malnutrition—which leaves many of its victims unable to care adequately for themselves and poses a

growing burden on the community. [32]

Protein caloric deficiency is insidious in its onset. [60-3] A human has indicators which tell him when he is not getting sufficient calories; he is hungry or begins to waste away. He has no similar warning when he is getting insufficient protein. A hungry man, mother, or child is not choosy about the food eaten. If given ample calories of corn, arrow-root, rice, manioc or cassava, they will appease their hunger and not worry whether they are getting enough animal protein. For this reason animal protein deficiencies grow stealthily to significant proportions, unsuspected, because protein-starved people are not actually hungry and their bodies do not waste away.

Animal protein consumption in prosperous countries such as the United States runs about 225 pounds per person per year. In developing countries it is thirty-five pounds or about one and one-half ounces a day. [99-3] Were this available animal protein equally divided among the population, it would barely suffice to keep a mature individual in protein balance in an environment free of stress situations. However, certain classes get much more than their share, while others must do without. South American peasants consume about two thousand calories of food per day but rarely experience the taste of animal protein. Also, periods of physiological stress such as illness, pregnancy and lactation, hard work, loss of sleep and rest, accidents, surgery, etc., increase the body's need for protein many times above this minimum figure.

The need for proteins is greatest during the period when the largest mass of protein tissue is being formed, that is, during the time of active growth. The fastest growth takes place during pregnancy, when the fetus grows from a single microscopic cell to six or more pounds at birth. Growth continues at a gradually lessening pace until maturity. After maturity the body does not require protein to build new tissue, but only enough to repair that which wears out. Because of this we must look for the consequences of protein deficiency in the newborn, the children, and youth of any population.

It has been estimated that 60% of the world's pre-school

children today suffer varying degrees of protein caloric mal-nutrition. [91-16] Fifty per cent of African children die between weaning and school age, one-third of them from dietary protein deficiency. This alone amounts to an annual worldwide mortality of three million human children due to protein deficit. Even in our prosperous country we find, in the "poor South," children subsisting on flour, grits and beans, or fried mush and fatback—diets virtually free of animal protein. [92-9] Deaths of infants and children from malnutrition, while lamentable, are actually less distressful to a community than are those who survive, but are *retarded*.

This retardation may be of two types, physical and mental.

Physically retarded babies are born of protein-starved mothers and nursed with protein-poor milk. On weaning they are given foods containing little or no animal protein. Thus, during the period of greatest need, vital animal proteins are denied them. These are the puny, sickly babies with low resistance to infection, who grow to be puny, sickly adults. [32] Most die in infancy, but those fortunate enough to get an optimum post-natal diet may survive and outgrow their physical ineffectiveness to some extent.

Mentally retarded babies, however, can never outgrow their affliction. [32] This is because the central nervous system is the only tissue of the body that, once injured, can never regain any function that has been lost. To be sure, peripheral extensions of the nervous system such as the peripheral nerve trunks may, if severed or injured, regenerate to varying degrees. But this is not true of the actual nerve cells themselves, which make up the working substance of the brain and spinal cord.

Formation of the brain cells begins in very early pregnancy and continues for several years after birth. If any of these cells are imperfectly formed or are subsequently injured, killed, or become abnormal for any reason, their repair or recovery can never take place.

Unhealthy or deformed brain tissue is formed during pregnancy if a protein-starved mother is unable to contribute the necessary amino acids to the fetus. This is where mental retardation due to protein deficiency begins. [74-17]

During nursing, the infant may or may not receive sufficient animal protein from the mother and may or may not develop further retardation. Under either circumstance, replacement or improvement in the function of the defective brain substance already laid down cannot occur. The same is true in post-natal life. No matter how perfect the growing child's diet, improvement of mental retardation stemming from pre-natal or early post-natal periods cannot be achieved. [88-10]

The presence of retarded individuals unable to care for themselves in any population, imposes a drain upon human and material resources which must be utilized to the fullest in the coming effort to feed and clothe our billions of descendants in the coming centuries. Callous though it might seem, children dying of malnutrition do not pose this burden on future generations.

This is the pattern of malnutrition for the present: some deficit of total calories, but a much more significant protein caloric malnutrition which threatens to become more widespread in the years to come.

What about the future?

Clearly, if we are unable to prevent caloric and protein deficiency in our present world population, we cannot keep the nutritional books even approximately balanced in the future unless we hold our population at its present figure, or greatly intensify food production, particularly that of animal proteins.

Let us take up first the problem of our population explosion. Why are we having one, and will it continue?

One might say it all started with a chap named Malthus. [96-3] In 1798 this scholarly English gentleman published a thesis entitled, "An Essay on the Principles of Population." In this essay Malthus merely pointed out that whereas food supplies increase in an arithmetic ratio, population grows by geometric proportions. [30] Any population, if unchecked, will double itself each twenty-five years. The biological check on population growth is insufficient food.

This is how Malthusian dynamics work. Take an apocryphal island in the ocean. There was on this island, in the year 1875, a population of five thousand people. These inhabitants were supported comfortably by cultivating 25% of the arable lands of the island. Being unrestricted (having

plenty of food), the population doubled in twenty-five years, so that in 1900 there was a population of ten thousand. It had been necessary to double the lands under cultivation to feed them. By 1925 the population had again doubled so that there were twenty thousand people on the island. The farms had again been doubled in number and everyone was happy until 1950, when the census rose to forty thousand, which called for further doubling of agricultural activity, but by then the entire island was already under cultivation. No further increase was possible and people began to starve!

Our world is an island in space. We are, believe it or not, nearing the saturation of our agricultural potential. As shown, people are already beginning to suffer from hunger and protein malnutrition. Is our "doom boom," as it has been called, really at hand?

Let us trace briefly how the population of earth has grown since the beginning of the Neolithic era. [30] [82-3] [85-3] [107-5]

<u>Year</u>	<u>World Population</u>	<u>Birth Rate</u>	<u>Population U.S.A.</u>	<u>Population Washington State</u>
8000 B.C.	5 million	50/1,000		
1 A.D.	250 million			
1650	500 million	40/1,000	0.05 million	
1750	694 million		1.2 million	
1790	1.0 billion		3.9 million	
1900	1.6 billion		76.0 million	0.05 million
1915			100.0 million	
1950	2.5 billion		151.0 million	2.4 million
1962	3.0 billion	36/1,000		2.8 million
1965	3.1 billion		195.0 million	
1967			198.0 million	
2000	6.0 billion		362.0 million	6.3 million
2070	25.0 billion			

This table leaves no doubt that our population is exploding everywhere faster and faster, even in the face of a *falling* birth rate. Hyperpessimistic students have come up with some frightening statistics, some patently ridiculous, such as the prediction that by the year 2650, each person will have but one square foot of earth upon which to stand. [88-6] [95-1] In spite of such fright figures and an avalanche of sensible statistics, only a handful of thoughtful individuals seem to concern themselves with the reality of widespread famine in the relatively near future.

The great bulk of civilized mankind is well-fed. Starvation is but a minor and local factor, at this time hardly more than a straw in the wind. Protein deficiencies in our modern diet remain unsuspected even by those suffering from them. Under such propitious portents our population seems prone to procreate with even more enthusiasm than in past generations. It is inevitable that we will have more billions before we have fewer. Eventually some regulatory process for reproduction will be in force, but probably not before the world population has again doubled or even tripled. This will require a doubling or quadrupling of present food resources. Far more important than simple caloric increases will be the necessary eightfold multiplication of animal protein foods.

There are a number of ways by which we may strive to achieve this—if we start now.

Chapter 23

FORECASTING FUTURE FOODS

Probably the first effort to be made in quadrupling the total supply of food calories should be the exploitation of present arable lands to their maximum. Genetic improvement of plants used for food could increase the yield per acre, their resistance to disease, drought, heat and cold, and can lessen consumer cost, thus effecting a 25% increase in food production. The use of more and better herbicides to eliminate depletion of soils by weeds and other non-food vegetation, together with more effective pesticides, could achieve another 25% gain. [32]

All growing plants require, among other things, two vital substances: sunshine for the production of carbohydrates by photosynthesis, and nitrogen, necessary for the production of plant proteins. Repletion of nitrogen-poor soils must be a continuous process if maximum yields are to be maintained. Our greatest pool of nitrogen is contained in the air, but to be used by plant or beast, this gaseous nitrogen must be combined with other elements (nitrogen fixation), and nature strongly resists such a combination. [96-16] Nitrogen fixation is an expensive process, accomplished commercially only at high temperatures, making the use of such chemical fertilizers quite costly. Less than 10% of the fixed nitrogen used in agriculture is synthetically produced in fertilizer factories. A new source of cheap power is needed,

possibly the use of atomic wastes, or discovery of new catalysts for the process which would make possible cheap organic nitrogen fertilizers from the air. [85-1]

The other 90% of the fixed nitrogen produced each year comes from biological sources, that is, from living organisms. Chief among these are the *legumes*, plants capable of creating fixed nitrogen from gaseous nitrogen of the air. [12] Legumes are, for the most part, considered to be cattle fodder. They include clover, alfalfa, and soy beans, as well as peas and beans, some of which are fit for human consumption. These plants operate in partnership with a strain of soil bacteria called *Rhizobium*. As this particular partnership flourishes in the growing plant, nitrogen from the air is combined and allowed to permeate the soil. A major disadvantage of this method of enriching the soil is that while these crops are being grown, the field cannot be employed to produce higher quality human food crops.

It has been found that fixation of nitrogen by soil organisms increases markedly when concentrated carbohydrates, such as sucrose, is added to the soil. At last an honorable and harmless use for sugar has been discovered, one actually beneficial to mankind.

Future hope of soil repletion by soil bacteria lies in the possibility of extracting an enzyme from the *Rhizobium* bacteria capable of accomplishing nitrogen fixation in factories, without organisms, plants, or fields in which to grow them.

Blue-green algae, related to the unaesthetic pond scum, are free-living aquatic plant organisms. About forty strains are known to fix nitrogen. [96-16] These algae are versatile and not at all demanding as to their abode. Algeal nitrogen fixation takes place on rock and soil surfaces of the Antarctic, in the boiling hot springs of the Yellowstone, and in sea water as well as fresh. In rice paddies they have been found to contribute twenty to forty-five pounds of fixed nitrogen per acre per year. Adaptation of blue-green algae for a similar role in dry land farming is another hope for the future. Experiments utilizing dried algae as a single food source for humans, in connection with space travel, have been disappointing, since diarrhea usually appears. It has been suggested that the absence of fat in this diet might be responsi-

ble, possibly akin to the "rabbit diarrhea" previously described. The Kanembu tribe of Africa, however, supplement a meagre diet with it successfully. [108-14]

Securing maximum food production from all presently arable lands would easily wipe out any caloric deficit that exists today, and would doubtless allow a doubling of present agricultural yields. It would not suffice very far into the future. To achieve the quadrupling of food production necessary in fifty years, arable land areas must be increased.

Reclamation of deserts by irrigation from nearby surface waters and subterranean lakes could increase by one-third the fertile area of the earth. Israel had succeeded in augmenting by 18% the annual rainfall of arid regions by cloud seeding. Another group of Israeli have proved the success of irrigating small parcels of the Negev desert with saline from adjacent seas. Certain food crops, including some cereals, oilseeds, melons, tomatoes, sugar cane, and a number of forage crops have been successfully harvested. [98-13] Genetic improvement of some plants to increase their tolerance for salt appears likely. Still another possibility in rehabilitating the desert awaits a practical method of desalting sea water.

Reversal of the present trend toward suburbanization would free millions of acres for crop use if all homes and yards were eliminated, and replaced with high-level structures capable of housing a thousand families on the ground space formerly accommodating a dozen or so. Space for new supermarkets, highways, and parking lots is being gobbled up at a rate of three thousand acres each day—a loss of food-producing potential for twelve hundred people. If the going gets really rough, these acres must be returned to the plow.

More complete utilization of crops for human, rather than animal food is being tested. The use of oilseed residues, after pressing the oil from the soy bean, the cottonseed and the peanut, as human nutriments instead of cattle fodder, would increase the world's food supply very quickly, [96-14] except that the anti-nutritive substances (gossypol) in some of these products greatly limit their use in human nutrition. [32]

Ingenious texturizing of vegetable material, such as soy

beans, to look like meat, is being developed, but this does not result in any nutritional enhancement or ease of digestibility and makes soy bean foods quite expensive. [99-4] It has been pointed out that the desire for lobster and steak will not be satisfied by a mock chicken leg or a simulated hamburger patty. Perhaps hunger would force a more ready acceptance of these pseudo-animal proteins, but we would not realize the slightest nutritional advantage over plain boiled beans.

Easy and efficient processing of plant material, of no use as a human food, is described by Pirie. [80-1] [91-26] Extraction of the foliage yields a concentrate of leaf protein which may be incorporated into human nutriments. However, this substance is still only vegetable protein, and is incapable of replacing the animal protein vital to human nutrition.

All of this expanded and accelerated agricultural industry will accomplish but one thing—the production of more vegetable foods. Plants contribute but three things to the human: plant proteins, vegetable oils, and carbohydrate calories—mostly the latter. Only about 1% to 12% of most vegetation is protein. An adult, whose protein requirements are minimal, must have at least 14% of his diet in the form of protein. An adult eating only vegetables, even those with the highest protein content, would be always absolutely protein-deficient by 2% of his requirement. Of greater importance by far is the fact that the proteins offered by the plant world are specifically deficient in one or more of the essential amino acids, [33] without which man as well as any other carnivorous life cannot survive. Thus no matter what increase in plant foods we are able to accomplish, they alone cannot keep a single member of the human race in healthful nutritional balance.

This means that while it is all right to increase production of plant material to fill a caloric deficit, the vital increment in food production must be in the field of animal protein or, as an alternate, we must devise a method by which the plant proteins may be made complete by giving them their missing essential amino acids. [32] [96-14]

In order to be somewhat clearer in explaining this busi-

ness of proteins, amino acids, and essential amino acids, it should be recalled that any protein, either plant or animal, consists of a combination of amino acids, of which there are about twenty, in varying ratio to each other. Ten of the amino acids are *essential*, that is, they cannot be synthesized by the human body but must be obtained from foods (Chapter 7). Plant proteins are lacking in one or more of the essential amino acids. Animal proteins from any source always contain a full complement of these vital essential amino acids. Animal proteins, therefore, are a prime requisite for the human diet. They are the only preventive for protein malnutrition!

The following tabulation lists (only) the essential amino acids and indicates which cereal grains are deficient in each. [32] [33]

<u>Essential Amino Acid</u>	<u>Daily Requirement grams</u>	<u>Deficient in</u>
Threonine	1.0	Wheat, rice, peanut
Valine	1.6	
Leucine	2.2	
Isoleucine	1.4	
Phenylalanine	2.2	
Methionine	2.2	Beans, corn, yeast, peanut
Tryptophan	0.5	Wheat, corn, yeast, cotton seed, peanut
Lysine	1.6	Wheat, corn, rice
Histidine (essential to the infant only)		
Arginine	?	

Now it may be understood why poor Southerners eating tryptophan-deficient corn developed pellagra, and why animal protein-starved infants in Africa develop *kwashiorkor* today. [32]

From this tabulation it may also be seen that if geneticists can breed rice which contains threonine and lysine, beans with methionine, corn with tryptophan, wheat with lysine and tryptophan, yeast with methionine and tryptophan, etc., we could dispense with the eating of animal proteins except for pleasure. While botanists have progressed in a small measure toward this goal, no practical success in making plant proteins equivalent to animal proteins in human nutrition has been accomplished, and the future of this particular research appears bleak indeed.

One stumbling block to this solution is the intolerable amount of carbohydrate, with its attendant "malnutrition of excess," or obesity, that would of necessity accompany consumption of such a "complete" plant protein nutritional scheme. Another is the problem of cheaply rendering them digestible by the human alimentary tract, a major disadvantage to the present use of soy beans as human food.

Enrichment of certain cereal grains by adding their deficient amino acids after harvesting is a more realistic achievement. [96-11] For instance, lysine may be synthesized for about \$1 per pound, and this amount would supply that missing essential amino acid in rice for one person for a year. However, this single addition would still leave rice deficient in threonine. As others of the essential amino acids become cheaply available, corn, wheat, legumes, and other deficient plant proteins may be similarly treated. Still remaining is the problem of digestibility and excessive carbohydrate calories.

With all these assists to the production of plant food calories by increasing land, irrigation, fertilization, use of cattle feeds for human nutrition, enrichment of cereal grains, and genetic improvement of existing vegetation, the world can doubtless achieve the necessary fourfold increase in carbohydrate and plant protein necessary for feeding the next three or four generations. Past this maximum a further increase appears impossible, short of some technical break-

through in scientific nutrition not even dreamed of at this time.

But what about the eightfold increment in animal proteins that will be of such exigent importance? This is a much more urgent need. As early as 1970 the world deficit of high-grade utilizable animal protein was ten million long tons. [91-16]

Animal geneticists have had scarcely more luck in their field than have their plant-breeding colleagues. Improvement by selective breeding to create "easy feeders"—animals less susceptible to disease and pests, with greater milk production and utilizable protein per carcass—has been accomplished to some degree, but it is difficult to envisage massive increases in animal protein production as a result of these means.

An exception to these rather sterile accomplishments is the outstanding feat of marine biologist Professor Lauren A. Donaldson, of the University of Washington. [94-1] By applying agricultural principles of hybridization he succeeded in producing a strain of "superfish," each of which is capable of producing progeny amounting to ten tons of edible fish each year. [108-10] His hybrids include both salt-water salmon and fresh-water trout. This is indeed a worthwhile harvest of the highest grade of animal protein.

The fact that less than 1% of fish spawn ever survive suggests the desirability of somehow protecting smaller fishes from predators and natural hazards.

While it is difficult to visualize fish farms, these have been under study and limited operation for a number of years. [96-20] Raising crops of fixed bivalves, such as oysters and mussels, is limited by the rarity of suitable environments in which they will breed. [92-9] The free-swimming spawn are still susceptible to predators, the morality from this cause approaching 100%. Finally, there is the considerable labor of harvesting and shelling these crops, which places them in the category of luxuries rather than cheap food for protein-deficient populations. [96-13]

Farms for fresh-water fish such as trout have the same disadvantages as shellfish culture. Fresh- and salt-water farms, capable of sequestration from the main body of water

by barricades across the neck of an inlet, have been described, [99-2] but again, the expense of maintaining this industry makes it an impractical source of cheap protein. It has recently been shown that areas of water, "curtained" by a wall of air bubbles rising from perforated pipes on the bottom, effectively prevent the fish crop from wandering off and keep predators from wandering in. [107-6] Electric fences are under investigation, but no large-scale operation of fish farms has been reported.

While fish farms hold out but scant hope for a solution of the protein crisis, utilization of the fish already in the sea gives greater promise. [32] It has been estimated that only about 52,000,000 wet weight tons of fish are caught annually, and of this volume, only about 60% is eaten by humans; the rest is used as animal feed. The best authorities believe that the annual fish harvest can be only tripled before fish stocks begin to decline. Thus, the answer to protein deficit is not in eating more and more of the choice food fish, but in the direction of using more and more of the "scrap" or "bottom" fish now being passed over as a human food. [99-2] These scrap fish, every bit as nutritious as the choicer varieties, include species known as hake, jack mackerel, inferior grades of tuna, pilchard, saury, squid, dogfish, redfish and some species of cod. Processing of fish flour, or fish protein concentrate as it is more elegantly called, consists merely of grinding these scrap fish, extracting their fats and other odorous components, and reducing them to a fine powder. [108-5] [108-6] Light gray in color, the material is odorless and practically tasteless. It may be mixed with wheat or other flours and baked into bread, added to milk or milk shakes, gravies, vegetable stews, and soups, or incorporated by manufacturers into noodles, macaroni, and cereals. This method of enriching plant proteins is cheaper, easier, and more effective than the use of synthetic amino acids previously mentioned. At present rates, fish protein concentrate could supplement protein-deficient diets for about one-half cent per day. It has been shown to be fully effective in curing kwashiorkor in infants.

Other unorthodox foods from the sea include eels and the sea mammals—seals, whales, dolphin, walrus, and the

manatee. [98-12] It should be pointed out that with the exception of some whales and the manatee, these animals compete with man for the fish of the sea as food.

Marine animals, when consumed by another marine animal, are converted to the protein of the latter very inefficiently. [32] It requires about seven pounds of protein food to add a single pound to the weight of the consumer. [12] [99-2] Food for spawn and other tiny fishes is usually animal plankton—minute free-swimming animal life. Seven pounds of plankton will thus account for the protein of a one-pound fish. Seven of these fish, when eaten by a larger fish, will add one pound to the weight of the latter. [74-24] A thirty-pound fish will have eaten more than 210 pounds of smaller fish (equivalent to 1,470 pounds of plankton) to gain adult stature. These figures, impressive as they are, do not come close to being realistic for two reasons. First, our calculations involve transfer of protein only through three cycles: from plankton to small fish to large fish to whale. Each transfer has been accompanied by a loss of seven pounds of protein for one. If, as is probable in nature, the transfer of protein had been from plankton to tiny fish, to small fish, to medium fish, to fair-size fish, to big fish, to porpoise, to killer whale—a total of seven cycles, each accompanied by a seven for one loss, the waste of edible protein from all this piscivorous activity becomes incalculable. A second reason for the lack of realism in these figures is that they do not take into account at all the amounts of protein necessary to fulfill requirements for tissue repair, metabolic activity, and energy of the marine animals involved.

A blue whale, swimming at twelve knots, develops 1,700 horsepower which (if an outrageous pun may be forgiven), represents the burning of a whale of a lot of protein calories. [107-10]

If the time ever comes when man is really starving from a lack of animal protein, abundant supplies will become available merely by exterminating fish-eating mammals, or at least utilizing them for food. Better yet would be the direct use of animal plankton by man for food. [96-15] [99-2] These tiny forms of animal life would be excellent sources of high-grade animal protein, provided they could be harvested and

processed efficiently. [19] If man consumed large amounts of plankton the marine life might suffer, but this would be preferable to the seven for one loss entailed in competition with fish for it.

An exception to this generalized condemnation of sea life competing with man for animal proteins is the manatee or sea cow. [98-12] This marine mammal, as does its dry land counterpart, eats only vegetation, totally unfit for human consumption. These creatures could probably be domesticated and become a valuable food animal for humans. [74-24]

It would indeed be wonderful if food animals could put protein pounds on their frames without consuming any proteins. This would be almost like getting something for nothing, and it seems that it can be done!

Previously noted (Chapter 5) was Professor Virtanen's herd of dairy cattle, which was maintained on non-protein nitrogen compounds together with starch, cellulose, and sugar. [96-8] This ration contains absolutely no protein, either plant or animal. Professor Virtanen points out that it requires sixty grams of crude digestible protein for each quart of milk produced, and in addition at least three hundred grams of protein for maintenance of the cow. A good milk cow would therefore require about twelve hundred grams of protein each day. This normally comes partly from plant proteins contained in fodder, but may be obtained equally well by feeding them urea and ammonia, from which the microbia of the rumen synthesize all of the amino acids, including the essential ones. Food for the microbia and carbohydrate for the animal are obtained from the starch-sugar-cellulose compound. Both urea and ammonia may be synthesized in quantities adequate for this purpose, while the other components of the diet may be secured from wood, [85-5] waste paper, [85-4] scrap vegetables, and other vegetable sources. [91-23] Animals thus fed produce good quality milk and healthy calves. [98-10] Meat animals, such as lambs, goats, and steers, grow satisfactorily on this synthetic diet. This is indeed getting high-grade animal protein for nothing—well, almost.

Since the rumen of the cow, in which all this activity takes place, contributes no essential secretions, it appears

that its function is merely that of a pouch held at a constant temperature in which the microbia convert certain substances into animal protein. Does this suggest an exciting possibility? Would we eventually be able to do away with the cow and accomplish the necessary conditions for the microbial synthesis of high-quality animal protein by a mechanical rumen in the laboratory? A meaningful stride in this direction has already been taken. [85-6]

Another method of getting high-grade proteins for almost nothing is described by a corps of petroleum chemists. [98-6] Certain bacteria and yeasts exhibit a great affinity for petroleum hydrocarbons—plain old crude oil. The organisms receive nourishment from this substance, grow, and multiply. One pound of petroleum will produce a pound of yeast, much more efficient than the protein conversion factor of seven for one in animals.

Purified yeast is a pale yellow powder, which can be incorporated into foods in the same manner as fish flour. A factory covering about three hundred square yards—less than half the size of a football field—could produce one ton of yeast protein in a single day. A one-ton steer produces less than a pound of protein each day, but a ton of yeast can produce fifty tons of yeast protein in the same time. Cost of the substance would be about thirty-five cents per pound. Yeast protein, while somewhat low in the two essential amino acids, methionine and tryptophan, contains a great deal of lysine, the acid most frequently deficient in cereal grains. [91-16] Killed yeast organisms are easily digested and absorbed.

Methane, or natural gas, has been similarly used as a food for certain bacteria capable of utilizing it. [88-9] [91-16] [108-12] Ten tons of protein could be derived from two million cubic feet of the gas, which is available in almost limitless quantities. Bacterial protein is said to possess a somewhat more balanced spectrum of essential amino acids than does yeast.

Appropriateness of the manatee as a food animal because it does not compete with man for its subsistence has been mentioned. In this sense cattle, which eat grain, vegetables, and other food which may be used by man, are also

competitive with him, unless Professor Virtanen's unique diet will remove them from this category. Man does not eat grass, twigs, leaves, brush, or tundra; therefore the bison, water buffalo, antelopes, caribou, and other deerlike animals capable of surviving on this scrub should be allowed a place in the scheme of things, although they should be efficiently used for food. Large animals such as the elephant, hippopotamus, and giraffe are not eaten by man but devour large amounts of the available plant life which is vital to the nourishment of other animals that *can* be used as food by man. When things get really serious, there will be no place on earth for these animals that compete either directly or indirectly with man for food. Man will be required to make a choice: either eliminate them or eat them. The horse fits into a similar class, since he is no longer a beast of burden.

Insects as a source of food have been seriously advocated. Extracts of certain insects yield high-grade protein material which may be used in the same way as other protein concentrates. [93-1]

Without doubt the greatest direct competitors with man for protein foods are the carnivorous predators. The predation of aquatic mammals has been noted. Fresh-water predation by the lamprey has depleted the fish population of the Great Lakes. [85-1] Alligators and crocodiles further deplete sources of animal protein. The predation of land carnivores is of importance. There are four thousand tigers left in India and each tiger eats six thousand pounds of meat each year; [96-12] an adult lion consumes about the same. [103-1] Unfortunately, Indian tigers rarely feast on the parasitic sacred cows, which continue to compete with useful food animals and even hungry humans for subsistence. Other predators of the cat family, the canines, and also the bears wrest precious proteins from the dwindling supply for human use.

Will they be eliminated, or will man?

I am certain that when the Creator told Man to "propagate his kind" He did not intend him to do so quite so much.

But Man did and our population explosion *is* here at hand.

What to do?

There is a perfect and specific answer to the dreadful dilemma facing us. It does not, however, lie in the direction of agricultural growth or increased protein production, for both of these are finite—helpful for the present but incapable of the unlimited expansion needed for future generations of unrestricted human breeding.

Clever synthesis and processing of vegetable materials to make them resemble meat will not make it any more appropriate for human digestive capabilities, divest beans and grains of their anti-nutritive properties, or nullify human dependence upon essential amino acids.

What, then, is the perfect and specific answer?

Simply this: *hold world population at its present figure!*

This can be accomplished by birth control, which limits reproduction to superior types of individuals; by practicing euthanasia of imperfect newborns, and by strictly balancing death and birth rates by an omnipotent Bureau of World Census. [85-7] A small whisper of action along political lines has already been ventured. [100] Former United Nations Secretary-General U Thant believes that we have no more than ten years to get started. As he says, ". . . the members of the United Nations . . . (must) subordinate their ancient quarrels and launch a global partnership to curb the arms race, to improve the human environment, to defuse the population explosion . . ." [107-9]

APPENDIX

LOW CARBOHYDRATE DIET

The purpose of this diet is to drastically restrict those foods (starches, carbohydrates, sugars and raw fruits and vegetables) which are irritating to the colon and maintain nutrition by confining the diet to those foods (meats, fats, protein and low starch cooked vegetables and fruits) which are non-irritating. Since most of the calories in the ordinary diet come from the starches and carbohydrates, some weight loss on this diet might be noted. This need cause no alarm, however, as such a reaction is to be expected.

THE FOLLOWING FOODS ARE TO BE AVOIDED ENTIRELY:

Cereals

Starch, flour, macaroni, bran, spaghetti, breakfast cereal, waffles or hot cakes, bread of all kinds, crackers, rice, bakery products, cookies, cakes, pies, etc.

Vegetables

Potato, dry or lima beans, cabbage, cauliflower, radishes, lettuce, celery, broccoli, cucumber, corn, rutabaga, peas, turnip and onion. NOTHING RAW.

Misc.

Candy, sugar, syrup, honey, *milk*, pastries, chocolate, puddings, custard, desserts, condiments, French dressing, nuts, pickles, creamed gravies or sauces, carbonated or sweetened drinks, prepared meats such as wieners, bologna or meat loaf, beer, wine, garlic, jams or jellies, barley.

Fruits

Prunes, figs, pineapple, berries; no fruit juice either fresh or canned.

THE FOLLOWING FOODS MAY BE EATEN FREELY:

Soups

Clear soups, consomme, bouillon, Cream soups made of vegetable puree from the following list and sour cream (one part) and water (two parts).

Vegetables

must be cooked or purchased canned.

carrot, string beans, asparagus tomato, mushrooms, zucchini, beet greens, celery, spinach, egg plant.

Fish

Any kind including shell fish, but no dressing except mayonnaise.

Meat

Any variety, except prepared meat containing flour or cereal.

Cheese

Any variety, including cottage cheese and Yogurt.

Eggs

Cooked in any way desired.

Salads

If made only with cottage cheese, gelatin, cooked fruit with mayonnaise. Combination salad (see recipe next page).

Fruits

Cooked (unsweetened), avoiding the juice. Sucaryl may be used to sweeten fresh stewed fruits. One ordinary serving once daily (pear, peach, apricot, apple *ONLY*).

Drinks

Coffee, tea, postum, sour cream (*NO MILK*), buttermilk, whiskey and water.

Desserts

Jello and cooked fruits, cheese, cooked fruit (sparingly). No ice cream.

Misc.

Olive oil, Knox gelatin, salad oil, butter, saccharin or sucaryl for sweetening, salt, vitamin capsules.

The amount of egg, fish or meat eaten each meal should be at least double the ordinary serving. Food may be taken between meals if desired so long as it is on the list.

Following are some recipes which may be used:

Combination Salad

Boil diced carrot, string bean, celery until tender. Drain and chill.

Mix in diced cheese, cold meat, shrimp, crab, chopped hard cooked egg, etc.

Top with sour cream or mayonnaise just before serving.

Sour Cream Sauce for Meat

Brown meat in butter in frying pan.

Arrange in baking dish.

Season to taste with salt and pepper.

Mix $\frac{1}{4}$ cup water with drippings in frying pan, pour over meat.

Cover and bake at 350° for 45 minutes.

Remove cover and spread with 1 cup sour cream, sprinkle with grated parmesan cheese.

Replace in oven uncovered until brown.

Sour Cream Soups

Use puree of tomato, spinach, asparagus, celery or carrot (1 part)

Add sour cream (1 part) and water (2 parts).

Heat but do not boil.

Homogenize with egg beater before serving.

Casserole

Arrange sliced zucchini, crooked neck squash or egg plant in casserole.

Add tomato puree, 1 bay leaf, 3 cloves.

Season and cover generously with sliced or shredded cheddar cheese.

Bake until done at 350°.

Frango Dessert

1 large egg

1 T. sucaryl

Few drops red coloring

Few drops peppermint flavor

1 cup sour cream

Few grains of salt.

Whip egg up very stiff, add sucaryl and coloring and continue to beat. Add peppermint flavoring and beat up stiff as an egg white. Fold in sour cream and salt. Chill in custard cups. May use Mapeline, rum or banana flavoring.

Sour Cream Custard

3 eggs beaten

2 tsp. sucaryl

1 cup sour cream

1 tsp. vanilla

1 tsp. cinnamon

½ tsp. nutmeg

¼ tsp. cloves

Combine ingredients and pour into buttered custard dish.

Place dish in pan of hot water. Bake in 300° oven for 1 hour.

Salmon or Meat Loaf

2 cups flaked salmon (or ground beef)

1 cup sour cream

$\frac{1}{2}$ tsp. salt
1 beaten egg
 $\frac{1}{2}$ cup chopped celery, a little chopped onion and green pepper.

Saute celery, onion and green pepper in butter for 10 minutes. Combine all ingredients in a greased baking dish; mix well. Bake in 350° oven until brown and set, about 30 minutes or until done.

Coffee Creme Fromage

1 envelope unflavored gelatin

$\frac{1}{2}$ cup strong cold coffee

$\frac{1}{2}$ cup boiling water

1 pkg. (8 oz.) cream cheese

2 egg whites

2 tsp. sucaryl or 16 tablets crushed.

Soften gelatin in $\frac{1}{4}$ cup of the cold coffee. Add boiling water, stir until dissolved. Stir in remaining $\frac{1}{4}$ cup coffee. Beat cream cheese until soft. Stir in gelatin mixture mixing until combined. Chill until slightly thickened. Beat egg whites until stiff. Gradually add sucaryl beating continually. Fold into gelatin mixture. Spoon into individual servings, chill until set. May top with canned peach.

Applesauce Souffle

2- $\frac{1}{2}$ cups applesauce

$\frac{1}{4}$ tsp. salt

$\frac{1}{2}$ tsp. cinnamon

$\frac{1}{4}$ tsp nutmeg

3 stiffly beaten egg whites

Mix applesauce, salt, cinnamon and nutmeg. Fold in egg whites. Place in pyrex bowl and bake in 350° oven in pan of hot water 40 minutes. May be served with sour cream topping.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND FOOTNOTES

BOOKS

- [1] *ACROSS THE OLYMPIC MOUNTAINS*, The Press Expedition 1889-90
Wood, Robert L.
University of Washington Press, Seattle-London—1967
- [2] *ANCIENT KINGDOMS OF THE NILE*
Fairservis, Walter A. Jr.
A Mentor Book, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York—1962
- [3] *ANIMAL EVOLUTION*
Carter, G. A.
Sidgwick and Jackson Ltd., London—1951
- [4] *ARCHAEOLOGY OF SAN FRANCISCO*
Suggs, Robert C.
Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York—1965
- [5] *A BOOK OF DOLPHINS*
Alpers, Antony
Pauls Book Arcade, John Murray Ltd.,—1960
- [6] *BRIDGE'S FOOD AND BEVERAGE ANALYSIS*
Mattice, Marjorie, A. B., Sc. M.
Lea and Febiger, Philadelphia—1950
- [7] *CANCER: DISEASE OF CIVILIZATION?*
Stefansson, Vilhjalmur
Hill and Wang, New York—1960
- [8] *CONTROVERSY IN INTERNAL MEDICINE*
Inglefinger, Franz J.
W. B. Saunders, Philadelphia and London—1966
- [9] *DR. CARLTON FREDERICKS' LOW-CARBOHYDRATE DIET*
Fredericks, Carlton, Ph.D.
Award books, New York—1965
- [10] *DRIFTWOOD VALLEY*
Stanwell-Fletcher, Theodora C.
Little Brown and Company, Boston—1947

[11] *EAT FAT AND GROW THIN*
Mackarness, Richard, Dr.
Doubleday and Company Inc., New York—1959

[12] *ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA*
William Benton, Publisher, Chicago—1970

[13] *FUNCTIONAL ANATOMY OF THE VERTEBRATES*
Quiring, Daniel P.
McGraw Hill, New York—1950

[14] *GASTROENTEROLOGY* (3 volumes)
Bockus, Henry L., M.D.
W. B. Saunders, Philadelphia-London, Second Ed.—1965

[15] *HANDBOOK OF CETACEAN DISSECTION*
Burne, R. H.
British Museum of Natural History, London—1952

[16] *HISTORY OF ART*
Janson, H. W. and Janson, Dora Jane
Prentice-Hall Inc., New York—1963

[17] *HYPERLIPIDEMIA AND HYPERLIPOPROTEINEMIA*
Sanbar, Shafeek S., M.D.
Little Brown and Company, Boston—1969

[18] *ISHI-In Two Worlds*
Kroeber, Theodora
University of California Press, Berkeley-Los Angeles
—1969

[19] *KON-TIKI*
Hyerdahl, Thor
Rand McNally & Company, Chicago—1950

[20] *LECTURES ON CONDITIONED REFLEXES*
Pavlov, I. P.
International Publishers, New York—1928

[21] *LET'S EAT RIGHT TO KEEP FIT*
Davis, Adelle
Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York—1954

[22] *LIVING OFF THE COUNTRY*
Angier, Bradford
The Stackpole Company, Harrisburg, Penn.—1956

[23] *MAN'S FOODS*
Jensen, L. B.
The Garrard Press, Champaign, Ill.—1953

[24] *MY LIFE WITH THE ESKIMO*
Stefansson, Vilhjalmur
The MacMillan Company, New York—1945

[25] *NATURAL ANTINUTRITIVE SUBSTANCES IN FOOD STUFFS AND FORAGES*
Gontzea, Iancu and Sutzescu, Paraschiva
S. Karger, Basel and New York—1968

[26] *999 SURVIVED*
Howard, Richard A.
Air University, Norwell A. F. B., Alabama

[27] *NUTRITION AND PHYSICAL DEGENERATION*
Price, Weston A., D. D. S.
Paul B. Hoeber, Incorporated, New York—1939

[28] *PEOPLE OF THE DEER*
Mowat, Farley
Little Brown and Company, Boston—1952

[29] *PHARMACOLOGIC BASIS OF THERAPEUTICS*
Goodman, Louis S. and Gilman, Alfred
The MacMillan Company, New York—1965

[30] *POPULATION, EVOLUTION, AND BIRTH CONTROL*
Hardin, Garrett
W. H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco and London
—1964

[31] *PRIMATES VI: Comparative Anatomy and Taxonomy*
Osman Hill, W. C.
John Wiley and Sons, New York—1966

[32] *PROCEEDINGS WESTERN HEMISPHERE NUTRITION CONGRESS—1965*
The American Medical Association, Chicago—1966

[33] *REVIEW OF PHYSIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY*
Harper, Harold A.
Lange Medical Publications, Los Altos, Calif.—1965

[34] *RIESEN DES MEERES*
Slijper, Everhard Johannes
Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Göttingen-Heidelberg—1962

[35] *SCOTT'S LAST EXPEDITION*
Scott, Captain R. F.
Dodd, Mead and Company, New York—1913

[36] *STRUCTURE OF THE MEAT ANIMALS*
MacGregor, Roderick
The Technical Press Ltd., London—1952

[37] *THE CALIFORNIA MISSIONS*
Lane Book Company, Menlo Park, California—1964

[38] *THE DESERT*
Leopold, A. Starker
Time Incorporated, New York—1961

[39] *THE DRINKING MAN'S DIET*
"Jameson, Gardner" and "Williams, Elliot"
Cameron & Co., San Francisco—1964

[40] *THE EPIC OF MAN*
Time Incorporated, New York—1961

[41] *THE FAT OF THE LAND*
Stefansson, Vilhjalmur
The MacMillan Company, New York—1957

[42] *THE GREAT APES*
Yerkes, Robert M.
New Haven—Yale University Press—1929

[43] *THE HISTORY OF PHYSICK*
LeClerc, D. (translated by Drake and Baden)
D. Brown, London—1699

[44] *THE HUMAN SPECIES*
Hulse, Frederick S.
Random House, New York—1963

[45] *THE MARCH OF MEDICINE*
Glasschieb, H. S.
Macdonald, London—1963

[46] *THE MARSH ARABS*
Thesiger, Wilfred
E. P. Dutton and Company Inc., New York—1964

[47] *THE MEDICINE SHOW*
Editors of *Consumers' Reports*
Consumers Union, Mount Vernon, New York—1963

[48] *THE OLYMPIC RAIN FORESTS*
Kirk, Ruth
University of Washington Press, Seattle-London—1966

[49] *THE PHYSIOLOGY OF DOMESTIC ANIMALS*
Dukes, H. H., D. V. M., M. S.
Comstock Publishing Company, Ithica, New York—1955

[50] *UNDISCOVERED AUSTRALIA*
Wilkins, Sir George Hubert, M. C.
G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London—1929

[51] *VANISHING PEOPLES OF THE EARTH*
National Geographic Society, Washington, D.C.—1968

[52] *WORLD OF THE PAST*
Hawkes, Jacquetta
Alfred A. Knopf, New York—1963

JOURNALS

[53] *AMERICAN HEART JOURNAL*
C. V. Mosby Company, St. Louis
—1 March 1963

[54] *AMERICAN JOURNAL OF CLINICAL NUTRITION*
The American Journal of Medicine, New York
—1 September-October 1959
—2 June 1962
—3 April 1966

[55] *AMERICAN JOURNAL OF DIGESTIVE DISEASE*
Harper and Row (Medical Division), New York
—1 November 1966
—2 December 1969

[56] *AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THE MEDICAL SCIENCES*
Lea and Febiger, Philadelphia
—1 June 1940
—2 December 1969

[57] *AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PROCTOLOGY*
American Journal of Proctology Inc.,
East Stroudsburg, Pa.
—1 August 1964
—2 June 1967

[58] *AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PUBLIC HEALTH*
American Public Health Association, New York
—1 April 1955

[59] *AMERICAN SURGEON*
J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia and Toronto
—1 January 1963

[60] *ANNALS OF INTERNAL MEDICINE*
The American College of Physicians, Philadelphia
—1 June 1965
—2 March 1966
—3 November 1966
—4 December 1966
—5 July 1967

[61] *ANNALS OF THE NEW YORK ACADEMY OF SCIENCE*
The New York Academy of Medicine, New York
—1 July 8, 1955

[62] *ARCHIVES OF INTERNAL MEDICINE*
The American Medical Association, Chicago
—1 March 1966
—2 July 1966

[63] *ARCHIVES OF PATHOLOGY*
The American Medical Association, Chicago
—1 March 1966
—2 December 1968

[64] *BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL*
British Medical Association, London
—1 June 12, 1965
—2 February 5, 1966
—3 March 11, 1967

[65] *BULLETIN OF THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION*
Geneva
—1 Volume 27, 1962

[66] *CANADIAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION JOURNAL*
Canadian Medical Association, Toronto
—1 January 30, 1965

[67] *CHEMISTRY AND INDUSTRY*
Society of Chemical Industry, London
—1 January 3, 1942

[68] *CIRCULATION*
The American Heart Association, New York
—1 March 1963
—2 December 1966

[69] *DENTAL TIMES*
Dental Times, New York
—1 June 15, 1965

[70] *GASTROENTEROLOGY*
Williams and Wilkins, Baltimore
—1 April 1950
—2 January 1970

[71] *GERIATRICS*
Lancet Publications, Minneapolis
—1 December 1969
—2 April 1970

[72] *INDUSTRIAL MEDICINE*
Industrial Medicine and Surgery, Chicago
—1 June 1949

[73] *JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN DIETETIC ASSOCIATION*
The American Dietetic Association, Chicago
—1 January 1953
—2 July 1953

[74] *JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION*
The American Medical Association, Chicago
—1 July 3, 1926

- 2 November 24, 1956
- 3 January 6, 1962
- 4 January 12, 1963
- 5 October 5, 1963
- 6 August 23, 1965
- 7 August 30, 1965
- 8 September 6, 1965
- 9 October 25, 1965
- 10 December 6, 1965
- 11 May 9, 1966
- 12 August 8, 1966
- 13 September 26, 1966
- 14 November 28, 1966
- 15 February 13, 1967
- 16 March 27, 1967
- 17 April 10, 1967
- 18 July 10, 1967
- 19 August 7, 1967
- 20 August 28, 1967
- 21 September 18, 1967
- 22 September 25, 1967
- 23 October 2, 1967
- 24 November 13, 1967
- 25 December 11, 1967
- 26 June 16, 1969
- 27 March 3, 1969
- 28 March 24, 1969
- 29 April 6, 1970
- 30 May 11, 1970

[75] *KLINISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT*—Berlin
—1 September 15, 1967

[76] *LANCET*
Little Brown and Company, Boston
—1 December 19, 1959
—2 December 23, 1961
—3 June 22, 1963
—4 September 11, 1965
—5 March 5, 1966
—6 October 8, 1966
—7 November 5, 1966
—8 March 4, 1967

[77] *MILITARY SURGEON* (Now *Military Medicine*)
Association Military Surgeons of the United States
Washington, D.C.

—1 July 1944
—2 August 1944

[78] *NATURE*

MacMillan Journals Ltd., Hampshire, England
—1 June 8, 1968

[79] *NORTHWEST MEDICINE*

Northwest Medical Publishing Association, Seattle
—1 July 1939

[80] *PROCEEDINGS OF THE NUTRITIONAL SOCIETY*

The Nutritional Society, London
—1 March 1969

[81] *SCHWEIZERISCHE MEDIZINISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT*

—Basel
—1 June 3, 1967

PERIODICALS

[82] *AMERICAN MEDICAL NEWS* (Formerly the *AMA News*)

American Medical Association, Chicago
—1 September 13, 1965
—2 July 25, 1966
—3 March 20, 1967
—4 December 4, 1967

[83] *CONSULTANT*

Smith, Kline & French Laboratories, Philadelphia
—1 June 1965

[84] *CURRENT MEDICAL DIGEST*

Williams and Wilkins, Baltimore
—1 September 1965
—2 July 1966
—3 November 1966

[85] *DATELINE IN SCIENCE*

Dateline In Science Inc., New York
—1 January 20, 1967
—2 February 3, 1967
—3 December 1, 1967
—4 January 5, 1968
—5 October 4, 1968
—6 March 6, 1970
—7 April 17, 1970

[86] *DIABETES OUTLOOK*

Diabetes Outlook Inc., New York

—1 July 1966
—2 March 1967

[87] *INTERNIST OBSERVER*

Internist Observer Inc., New York
—1 January-February 1970

[88] *MD*

MD Publications Inc., New York
—1 January 1965
—2 July 1965
—3 October 1965
—4 November 1965
—5 March 1966
—6 April 1966
—7 May 1966
—8 June 1966
—9 September 1966
—10 May 1967
—11 February 1968
—12 October 1968

[89] *MEDICAL COUNTERPOINT*

Herbert-Wheatley Inc., New York
—1 January 1970

[90] *MEDICAL SCIENCE*

Lippincott, Philadelphia
—1 February 1967
—2 April 1967
—3 January 1968

[91] *MEDICAL TRIBUNE*

Medical Tribune Inc., New York
—1 December 5, 1964
—2 December 30, 1964
—3 October 27, 1965
—4 November 6, 1965
—5 November 20, 1965
—6 January 5, 1966
—7 May 21, 1966
—8 June 29, 1966
—9 July 11, 1966
—10 August 15, 1966
—11 November 9, 1966
—12 November 16, 1966
—13 November 19, 1966
—14 December 7, 1966
—15 February 6, 1967

- 16 March 11, 1967
- 17 March 15, 1967
- 18 March 25, 1967
- 19 May 22, 1967
- 20 June 7, 1967
- 21 June 22, 1967
- 22 October 2, 1967
- 23 December 21, 1967
- 24 January 8, 1968
- 25 March 3, 1969
- 26 September 25, 1969
- 27 December 8, 1969

[92] *MEDICAL WORLD NEWS*

McGraw-Hill, New York

- 1 December 18, 1964
- 2 January 1, 1965
- 3 August 27, 1965
- 4 September 10, 1965
- 5 May 13, 1966
- 6 May 20, 1966
- 7 September 30, 1966
- 8 October 28, 1966
- 9 March 17, 1967
- 10 June 30, 1967
- 11 August 18, 1967
- 12 April 17, 1970

[93] *MODERN MEDICINE*

Cowles Communications Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.

- 1 June 20, 1966
- 2 November 7, 1966
- 3 May 22, 1967

[94] *NUTRITION TODAY*

Cortez F. Enloe, Jr., Wilton, Conn.

- 1 September 1966

[95] *PHAROS*

The Ovid Bell Press, Fulton, Missouri

- 1 October 1966

[96] *SCIENCE*

American Association for the Advancement of Science,
Washington, D.C.

- 1 May 26, 1939
- 2 April 15, 1966
- 3 May 6, 1966

- 4 June 10, 1966
- 5 July 8, 1966
- 6 August 5, 1966
- 7 August 26, 1966
- 8 September 30, 1966
- 9 January 13, 1967
- 10 February 3, 1967
- 11 February 17, 1967
- 12 March 3, 1967
- 13 September 15, 1967
- 14 October 13, 1967
- 15 November 10, 1967
- 16 December 15, 1967
- 17 July 5, 1968
- 18 July 26, 1968
- 19 August 16, 1968
- 20 September 13, 1968
- 21 August 8, 1969

[97] *SCIENCE DIGEST*

Hearst Corporation, New York
—1 July 1958

[98] *SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN*

Scientific American Inc., New York
—1 March 1956
—2 November 1964
—3 December 1964
—4 April 1965
—5 September 1965
—6 October 1965
—7 January 1966
—8 March 1966
—9 May 1966
—10 August 1966
—11 January 1967
—12 February 1967
—13 March 1967
—14 November 1968

[99] *TODAY'S HEALTH*

American Medical Association, Chicago
—1 May 1950
—2 November 1966
—3 March 1967
—4 February 1969
—5 January 1970

MAGAZINES AND NEWS MEDIA

[100] *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF THE 89TH CONGRESS*
Tydings, Hon. Joseph D.
—1 February 28, 1966

[101] *HOLIDAY*
The Saturday Evening Post Company, New York
—1 February 1965

[102] *LOS ANGELES TIMES*
—1 November 26, 1964

[103] *NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC*
National Geographic Society, Washington, D.C.
—1 April 1969

[104] *NEWSWEEK*
Newsweek Inc., Dayton, Ohio
—1 January 17, 1966

[105] *PARADE*
Parade Publications Inc., New York
—1 December 20, 1964
—2 May 3, 1970

[106] *READER'S DIGEST*
The Reader's Digest Association Inc., Pleasantville, New York
—1 September 1961
—2 March 1962
—3 January 1964
—4 November 1964
—5 October 1965
—6 March 1966
—7 June 1966

[107] *SEATTLE POST-INTELLIGENCER*
—1 January 7, 1965
—2 June 10, 1965
—3 July 11, 1966
—4 October 26, 1966
—5 December 4, 1966
—6 March 20, 1967
—7 November 24, 1967
—8 December 13, 1967
—9 May 10, 1969
—10 September 19, 1969

[108] *SEATTLE TIMES*
—1 July 16, 1965

- 2 September 12, 1965
- 3 December 5, 1965
- 4 December 8, 1965
- 5 December 24, 1965
- 6 April 26, 1966
- 7 October 12, 1966
- 8 October 26, 1966
- 9 November 16, 1966
- 10 December 20, 1966
- 11 April 5, 1967
- 12 December 10, 1967
- 13 April 13, 1969
- 14 August 29, 1969
- 15 May 24, 1970

[109] *TIME*

Time Inc., New York
—1 August 11, 1967

